

to the community, where 550 of them have managed to remain for three years or more. But, with a hospital population of nearly 5,000, an average of 100 discharges a year is not much to shout about. Byberry's routine therapy is now doing about as well.

By working his staff people almost beyond their endurance, Dr. Blain in the past 18 months has reduced Byberry's bed population from 6,100 to 4,850. He expects to move out another 1,000 to 1,500 in 1968 if federally supported social workers in Philadelphia find places for them in nursing homes, foster homes and geriatrics centers. By concentrating on new patients, the hospital has been able to send them out in three months, on the average, a creditable record.

"We have begun to function as a treatment center, not a warehouse," Dr. Blain said. "But I very much doubt that we can keep up this pace much longer without an increase in staff. The people we have are working twenty percent beyond their capacity."

"Also, the patients we have sent out were the easiest ones. We are getting down to the permafrost now, where it's like chipping ice with a spoon. Every tiny advance, from here on, will come only with tremendous detailed effort."

Shortchanging its mental hospitals is the poorest sort of false economy a state can practice, Dr. Blain feels.

"If we had been able to spend thirty-three million dollars to remodel this place, and if we had twenty-five million dollars a year to operate on for two years in a row, we could reduce Byberry's bed population to three thousand patients or less. When we reached this figure, the budget would begin to decrease. In fact, I would guarantee that I could reduce the budget ten percent a year for five years."

A custodial hospital obviously can be run more cheaply on a day-to-day basis than a treatment hospital, but in the long term it is vastly more expensive. "It's as simple as this," Dr. Blain says. "Spend twelve to fourteen dollars a day and get 'em out. Or spend five dollars a day and keep them forever." Since Dr. Blain's arrival, Byberry's per diem has risen from \$5.15 to \$8.20—still far from adequate.

Unless the legislature comes through in the next few years with a strong transfusion of new money, Dr. Blain thinks, it is hardly likely that Byberry can improve much further. There is, however, one bright hope for the future. Philadelphia, working mainly with federal funds, has done what he considers the best job in the country of setting up community mental-health centers. Ten are planned, with six in operation now, and they inevitably will take some of the pressure off Byberry. Plans are under way to tie Byberry

in with each of these centers. By special arrangement among city, state and federal governments, the centers will pay Byberry for handling patients from their "catchment areas" who need intensive care, and the centers in turn will provide aftercare for the patients Byberry treats and sends out.

Dr. Blain does not foresee that under such an arrangement Byberry will revert to its old custodial role. It will in time become a 2,000-bed hospital, he said—1,000 for patients in intensive care, 1,000 for patients taking part in an elaborate program of rehabilitation and strong possibility that, for all its unhappy history, Philadelphia will, through its mental-health centers, become once again a model for the nation in its treatment of the mentally ill.

Brown Power

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, now out of the Southwest our citizens are subjected to a new growth of the Communist divide-and-conquer cancer. This time it calls itself "brown power."

But the dress, the modus operandi, and the slogans all come from the same party line and robot brain teaching.

The revolting announcement is that the Senator from North Vietnam is mixed up with this bunch of revolutionaries also. Just a millionaire in the rough.

Wonder who's using whom. Or, perhaps, both think they are using the other. Can you imagine turning money over to a group like this and justifying it as for politics?

I include the article from Newsweek for March 25, as follows:

BROWN POWER

The slogans and rhetoric are reminiscent, the grievances—menial jobs, abusive cops, inferior schools—all too familiar. And like a troubled dream ominously replaying itself, the Brown Power Movement among the Southwest's Mexican Americans is moving down the track in the footsteps of black power—with little more than a shade of difference. Brown power has even developed the inevitable rift between moderates and hardline militants.

Spiritual leader of the moderates is ascetic Cesar Chavez, a Gandhiesque figure who last week ended a 25-day fast in support of the two-and-a-half-year-old strike by Mexican American farmworkers against California grapegrowers. As cheering, chanting strikers gathered around him at his home base of Delano, Calif., Chavez (with no less a strike sympathizer than Robert F. Kennedy at his side) told them the real reason for the fast was to renew their faith in nonviolence. "The justice of our cause is our weapon," he pleaded.

"KING TIGER"

Chavez had good reason to be concerned. Increasingly, frustrated Mexican Americans have been rallying to the banner of fiery spellbinder Reyes López Tijerina, 41, brown power's middle-aged equivalent of Stokely Carmichael. The hawk-faced Tijerina holds an electric appeal for young, vocal elements who have jammed into the urban-poverty pockets of the Southwest (where 87 per cent of the nation's 5 million Mexican Americans live). Last June, Tijerina—he prefers to be called Rey Tigre, for "King Tiger"—achieved legendary hero status as the accused leader of a "liberation" raid that freed eleven of his followers in a shoot-out at a New Mexico courthouse (Newsweek, June 19, 1967).

While he awaits trial on assault charges, Tijerina has been haranguing fledgling brown-power groups and white college students on the "crimes" of the U.S. Government, matching Carmichael and H. Rap Brown word for word in firebreathing anti-white rhetoric. "If the Anglo is frightened it is because his historical crimes are catching up with him," Tijerina shouts from the platform, behind a screen of "Brown Beret" bodyguards, largely a group of Mexican American college students who affect a Che Guevara style of dress.

The most dramatic demonstration of the new brown power came in a recent series of walkouts by thousands of Mexican American public-school students in East Los Angeles. Wearing buttons labeled "Chicano Power—Viva la Raza" (Mexican Power—Hall the Race), the students presented officials with a 40-point list of grievances against school conditions. The demonstrations began peacefully but after some rock and bottle throwing a dozen youths were arrested. Recently, uneasy police padlocked the Piranya, a favorite Brown Beret hangout, and began an intensive patrol of the district, four cops to each car. The angry reaction of one Brown Beret leader stirred warnings of yet another racial crisis for America:

"The students today have the guts our parents didn't . . . The Mexican American has just discovered how the democratic process works, after years of watching on the sidelines."

SENATE—Friday, April 5, 1968

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, in the holy pilgrimage of these sacred weeks we would join devout multitudes treading the way of sorrow, as we lift our eyes to a green hill outside a city wall and to a lone cross against the sky, a cross so old and yet so new.

As crusaders in the holy cause of human freedom may we conquer by that sign which forever is the inspiring symbol of joy through sorrow, strength out

of weakness, triumph out of failure, song through sacrifice, gain through loss, and life through death.

Father of all men—

"We stand atremble and afraid
On the small world that we have made.
Afraid lest all our poor control
Shall turn and rend us to the soul.
Afraid lest we should be denied
The price we hold our ragged pride,
But in the end we pass all by
For a lone cross against the sky."

In the shadow of that cross, give us grace to live and by that sign to conquer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 4, 1968, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2912) to authorize appropriations for the saline water conversion program for fiscal year 1969, and

for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 15399) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6 to the bill and concurred therein, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 16324) to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL PLACED ON CALENDAR

The bill (H.R. 16324) to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and placed on the calendar.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE DEATH OF DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, within a space of less than 5 years, a short time historically, John F. Kennedy and Dr. Martin Luther King have been assassinated. They were both American tragedies, senseless, vicious, and devoid of meaning.

In this troubled and violent period of our history, I hope and pray that all of our people will realize their responsibilities and work together to put into effect the rights guaranteed to all our citizens under the Constitution.

Only in this way can we overcome the inequities and the injustices which have marked too many of our people for too many centuries.

All of us, in a sense, are on trial. Dr. King was a man of moderation and hope. He was assassinated by an individual in a nation in which fear and violence are becoming more the norm rather than the rarity; a nation in which all too often events are decided by the gun and the mob.

This is a time for understanding, not violence; a time to pray and a time to hope; a time for awareness and reassessment; a time to weep but not to despair; a time to look at ourselves and

not to turn away; a time to re-read the Declaration of Independence; a time to put into effect that which the founders of this country said and meant, to wit:

We hold these truths to be self-evident; that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

It is a time for stability and maturity and understanding among all our people.

It is a time which will test us all, and in testing us, will test this country.

We are one nation. We are one people. Let us act accordingly.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, there are moments in the life of a nation when grief and outrage strike its people dumb, when words will not come because no words can express the agony in the Nation's soul.

Such a moment came on November 22, 1963; such a moment has come again on April 4, 1968. The murder of Martin Luther King, like the murder of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, tears from us a noble and irreplaceable leader. No nation can sustain such a loss without feeling abrupt shock and lasting pain.

All of us may ask what fool or villain, what manner of man could possibly have committed such an act of savagery. What mind could have overflowed with such hatred that it was moved to destroy such a man of peace?

No answer to these questions will suffice. The assassin must be brought to justice. But, Mr. President, punishment of the criminal will not soothe our conscience or dispel our sorrow. For the death of Martin Luther King leaves our Nation inconsolable.

We cannot assuage the loss of Martin Luther King. We can only redeem it by nourishing the spirit with which he imbued millions of Americans, both black and white. That spirit is one of conciliation and good will, of brotherly love and mutual respect, of fervent dedication to the nonviolent struggle for equal justice.

The mood of America today is necessarily confused and troubled. From it we must extract a new sense of direction and determination. If we are to be true apostles of this godly man, if we are to avoid the perils of division and civil strife, we must keep faith with the vision of Martin Luther King. We must not allow that vision to be shrouded in the bitterness and bigotry which moved the assassin.

This is a time for all Americans to look inward and to measure themselves. With whom will we stand: The man who fired the gun, or the man who fell before it? The honest rage of this day must not be spent in outbursts of the violence spawned by the murderer. The pain felt by Americans of all races over this terrible event will purify our Nation only if it generates a sober and profound commitment to relieve the injustice which Martin Luther King so valiantly opposed.

The ancient words of another land are a fitting proclamation for us: "The king is dead, long live the king." The king who lives and who must be followed is the man of peace, the spokesman of non-

violence, the preacher of tolerance, the advocate of human progress through love and cooperation. This is the spirit we must preserve, the legacy we must cherish.

Raucous voices now announce the death of nonviolence in America. It is up to us to prove them wrong. Bitter men declare their contempt for the doctrine of a man struck down by one ignorant of that doctrine. It is up to us to demonstrate the lasting strength and decisive value of what the victim proclaimed, not to mimic the viciousness and futility of what the villain did.

Nonviolence is not dead and we must not allow it to perish.

As Dr. King's life and works so vividly show, it is a powerful and vibrant force for good. It has brought this Nation far, though not yet far enough. It has added new dimensions to social justice in this land, though other dimensions remain neglected. It will carry us forward to that promised land which Martin Luther King glimpsed, and which he wished us all to share.

His sacrifice in the service of this great ideal calls us to accept the burden he has now laid down. As Americans we can receive no greater gift; as Americans we can pursue no higher goal.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, along with millions of Americans, I am saddened that a brave and dedicated citizen of this country was shot down last night by a cowardly assassin.

Dr. Martin Luther King, prophet of nonviolence, worked night and day to achieve equality of opportunity for all people, the very core of both the American system and the American dream.

Dr. King lived and died for his conviction that no citizen of his country should be a second-class citizen because of the color of his skin.

Let each of us search our hearts and minds as to the wisdom and the justice of his stand; because the decisions we thereupon make could well determine the future security and well-being of the United States.

AN EXTRA MEASURE OF DUTY

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the heart of America is heavy and our people are filled with a sense of shame and indignation. The bullet fired by a violent, monstrous bigot has stilled the peaceful voice of nonviolence in America. That terrible criminal act—God forbid—could reap a frightful whirlwind. It may be that that is precisely what the bigot hoped for and planned.

There is an extra measure of duty to his country falling on every citizen today. Each of us across the land, the governing and the governed, the black and the white, the rich and the poor, must exercise his best leadership with the best that he has in him in renewing America's quest for justice, in an atmosphere of peace, and for individual dignity for every citizen.

The death of Martin Luther King, Jr., leader of the movement of nonviolence, must not be followed by any eruption of terror or of lawlessness.

Mr. President, bigotry is on the march in America. Bigotry must be stopped. Extremism could destroy this country.

Extremism is not indigenous to any race. Extremism cut down the life of a peace-loving American last night. Let the law take its course. May justice be swift and sure. May the American people exalt our free society—and respect it—even as a depraved few seek to undermine and destroy it.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., was one of the very great men of our generation. He was a man of God. He was dedicated to the cause of complete civil liberties and civil rights for all Americans. He was dedicated to the idea of accomplishing this by nonviolence, by his eloquence and irrefutable logic. The assassination in Memphis, Tenn., and the assassination of President Kennedy in Dallas, Tex., have been the cruelest blows to the American people since the assassination of Abraham Lincoln. I fear the dread portent of the hour. I am fearful that violence is the curse of the land. We must not permit that.

It is ironic that the two greatest apostles of nonviolence since the birth of our Saviour nearly 2,000 years ago were Mahatma Gandhi and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and both suffered violent deaths at the hands of assassins. However, an assassin's bullet can never destroy the legacy of hope and freedom and peace that both of these great human beings bequeathed to men of all colors and creeds.

Those who are responsible for this violent deed have murdered an unoffending, God-fearing and innocent man of great good will. They have also killed something in the spirit and heart of America. Let us hope that out of this wanton and senseless act all Americans—Negro and white alike—will dedicate themselves anew to the ideals for which Martin Luther King lived and for which he died. We must go forward with a greater sense of urgency to make a reality of his dream of racial equality and social justice and strive to complete the great work in which he was engaged at the time of his death—the elimination of poverty from our Nation.

In his dream for a world filled with love, hope, and security he felt keenly the desperate yearning for peace of all people. His death will be mourned by hundreds of millions of men and women far from our Nation's shores as well as here at home. Good people of every shade of color and every creed know that they have lost a dear friend.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., is gone and his voice is stilled. However, his noble spirit will not die.

Mr. President, the death of Martin Luther King was a loss to our Nation and to mankind. He also was a husband and a father. To Mrs. Martin Luther King and to their children I join with all Americans in extending our deepest and heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I join Senators today in an expression of compassion for the widow and children of Martin Luther King. While nothing can relieve the grief that they will bear, we all hope that somehow their grief will be lessened by the resolve of our Nation to persevere in the ways of peace.

There is a grim irony and poignance in the fact that he died by the very violence that he saw threatening his country. We know from his last words and actions that he saw even his own crusade for equality among Americans menaced by the violence he deplored. For he deplored violence of every kind—violence abroad, violence at home, violence by whites, violence by blacks. At the moment of his death he was deeply troubled that his own long and arduous work might be subverted by persons and purposes and methods entirely foreign to what he sought to accomplish: the peaceful, lawful, orderly absorption of every American into the fullness of our national life.

As men and women, our reaction to the isolated deed of perverted violence must be one of sorrow for his family. As Americans, it must be one of renewed resolve that our vigorous national efforts toward full equality of opportunity and citizenship will be carried on within the flexible but peaceful framework of justice and legal order.

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, too many say that the Negro has lost a great leader in the murder of Martin Luther King. The fact is, America has lost a great leader.

Martin Luther King was a very great American. He was a man of peace who preached racial harmony with more eloquence than anyone else.

But, in the irony of his violent death, too few are likely to note that the measure of his greatness was not—I repeat, not—his gentleness and love of peace, but his dedication to a continuous protest to achieve the pride of full American citizenship for the American Negro.

If we are honest, we will recognize that in his life King's protest was not popular in white America, or in this body, or in Congress. By his own measure, he had failed to achieve his goal.

But now, by his tragic, martyred death, let us pray that King's dream, that great dream—as he touchingly expressed it at the Lincoln Memorial in the summer of 1963, which none of us can ever forget—will become understood and supported by white Americans, including those of us who serve in Congress, so that we can swiftly bring full American citizenship to the American Negro.

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. President, the words were spoken by a man from another country, over 300 years ago. John Donne's thoughts then are true today.

No Man is an Island, entire of itself; every man is a piece of the Continent, a part of the maine; if a Clod be washed away by the Sea, Europe is the less, as well as if a Promontory were, as well as if a Manor of thy friends or of thine own were; any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in Mankind; And therefore never send to know for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee.

Last night, in Memphis, the bell tolled for all Americans and for all men everywhere who believe in human justice, dignity, and brotherhood.

The Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, was, in truth, involved in all mankind. His deep faith in the rest of us, in our capacity ultimately to do what was right,

sustained him in his crusade for rights for all men. He had a dream that all men could live as brothers, and that dream, so eloquently expressed, gave our dreams and our consciences a direction for action.

He had a deeper faith, a more genuine faith in America than did most Americans. We who are left, diminished by his death, have the obligation to justify that faith.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, this country is not divided between black men and white men. This country is divided between good men and bad.

Last night, a good man, who was black, was foully murdered by a bad man, believed to be white.

From this martyrdom, good men, black and white together, must pledge themselves anew to the Christian principles for which Martin Luther King gave his life.

Otherwise, the bad men, whatever their color, will prevail and we shall come to catastrophe—all to be plunged into a bloodbath of hate.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, Martin Luther King is dead, a victim of man's persistent inhumanity to man. With his tragic passing, so sorrowfully reminiscent of the death of President Kennedy, we have lost the sanest and most persuasive voice for moderation and nonviolence this Nation ever had. Although Dr. King is dead, we must all pray that moderation and nonviolence have not died with him.

We in this Chamber can help to make that so, but we must act now—swiftly—to build for him a lasting monument of law.

Justice and equality of opportunity were always his goals. We in the Congress must now demonstrate our rededication to those same goals, not only out of a sense of compassion for his loss, but also because honor and duty require it.

Let the House pass the open housing bill. Let us pass the emergency job bill. Let us provide the funds to carry on the war on poverty. Let us pass the equal employment opportunity bill. Let us appropriate whatever is needed to bring meaningful educational opportunity to the deprived children of the slums.

Let us not cut back on Headstart programs. Let us now, for God's sake, before we are visited by national tragedy again, pass the Federal Gun Control bill.

In this way, we in Congress can build a living memorial to one of the greatest Americans of our generation.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I speak today, as others have spoken, with a heart full of grief and tragedy.

A great man and an apostle of peace has been taken from us.

This terrible tragedy has removed one of the greatest and most inspiring leaders this century has produced.

In addition to the great shock and deep feeling I have—which I know all share for Mrs. King and her children—it is also a dangerous and delicate hour in our national life. The wrong lessons can be read from this terrible event, as well as the right ones. The tendency will be to read the wrong ones first, that violence, which this terrible act demon-

strates, will tend to be repaid with violence with awful consequences to follow. We have already seen some riots in New York and in other cities throughout the country.

Our leadership should be directed toward the dignity, respect, and honor which this tragedy requires. That means the continuance of peace, the use of the processes of law to their utmost to find the miscreants, and the hope of binding up the wounds by the deep sorrow we manifest and by the affirmative actions which are looked for—and which Martin Luther King looked for—as the basis for the justice which he sought and for which he gave his life.

It requires—and I am delighted that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] has said it—the passage by the House of the Senate civil rights bill with relation to segregation in housing and the very kinds of crimes which are involved here which we would seek to punish effectively under Federal law.

Mr. President, Martin Luther King was a very great man. He would have been the first, if he could speak to us today, to counsel this kind of a living memorial.

The historic words "we shall overcome" are words of light, words of continuity, and words of optimism. That is the spirit of Martin Luther King.

There is much work for us to do. The civil rights bill now in the other body is one unfinished task. We will shortly be debating the supplemental appropriations bill, either today, or Monday or Tuesday next, which contains another kind of cause to which Martin Luther King was deeply dedicated.

There are other memorials which will keep his memory alive. There are schools, there are bridges, there are airports, and there are many other things in our Nation which should be used to remind our children that there was a Dr. Martin Luther King and how he served and how he loved his country.

What all of us should have in our minds and hearts in that he was for justice for men of all races, not just Negroes. For this he gave his life.

His life of nonviolence will overcome, provided we take the appropriate lessons from his life and tragic death, as I have tried to outline, under the grief of the moment, as some of those to which we have to repair today.

So let us not just speak words of memorial and pass the issue, but let us be deeply impressed by Dr. Martin Luther King's death as by his life, with the determination that we have it within our power to bring about a realization of the things for which he gave his life. Our greatest tribute to his memory will be to make them come true.

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, the murder of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., last night was a senseless act which does immeasurable harm to the cause of improved race relations. I wish to convey my sympathy to his family, and to express the hope that all people will remain calm in the face of his tragic death.

Dr. King led a cause which is controversial, but we must recognize that history clearly demonstrates that an idea or a purpose cannot be dampened by the

murder of its leaders. It disturbs me that in our civilized Nation this lesson has not been learned.

We must work with renewed dedication to resolve the problems of lawlessness and crime, and to end the divisiveness and polarization which threaten the American dream of peace and tranquility, and opportunity for all.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I deeply deplore the assassination of Dr. King. I regard this criminal act—this senseless act—as a tragedy for all Americans. The problems of our Nation cannot be solved by violence.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, many of us will rise today in an effort to express shock, sorrow, horror, and shame, and then find—as I do—that the English language, or at least my command of it, is inadequate.

These emotions are hard to express—you just say the words.

But how do you express the depth of that sorrow, the extent of that horror, the degree of that shock?

You can only hope that maybe it is not necessary, that others can sense your feelings because they share them, sharing perhaps also the inability to express them properly.

I have the feeling, for example, that my feelings about Martin Luther King's death will be readily understood by the wire service reporter—ordinarily an unemotional, tough-minded lady—who burst into unashamed tears during a discussion of the subject in the Senate coffeshop this morning.

I am tempted to make the point that whites and Negroes alike share a common pool of sorrow this morning—but that would be a superfluous remark to those many whites who, at bus stops this morning, murmured their grief to Negro strangers.

And yet we cannot make it overabundantly clear to everyone in this Nation that grief for this great man, this almost biblical figure, is universal among all its citizens.

To this end, certainly the Federal flags should fly at half-mast.

To this end, every citizen should feel no hesitation in expressing feelings of hurt and shock to neighbors, coworkers, and friends.

To this end, I would be hopeful that such a common grief might be expressed in an early memorial service, perhaps one on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial that could recapture that moving moment of brotherhood that characterized the civil rights march of 1963 when Martin Luther King spoke of his dream for America.

At this moment, the Nation is unified by its grief.

Before his death, Dr. King wrote an article that appears in *Look* magazine this week.

In it, he wrote:

All of us are on trial in this troubled hour, but time still permits us to meet the future with a clear conscience.

Dr. King's life was dedicated to such a future. We must all pray that his death will strengthen—not diminish—the Nation's drive to achieve it.

But, most of all—and I speak now to white Americans—we had better recognize that expressions of sympathy gratefully received are meaningless unless they are coupled with action, action on the fronts that have been identified for years. And that is Congress' responsibility, among many others', in this country.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King is a tragedy and one that makes me ashamed that a fellow man has done such an awful deed.

This murder is a double tragedy in that the apostle of nonviolence, Dr. King, was killed by violence which can produce even more hate and violence. He was truly a martyr to the cause of eradicating racial hatred, the most irrational hatred there is.

I would very much hope that we might accord Dr. King the honor of lying in state in the rotunda of the Capitol, and urge that thought upon my colleagues in the Congress. I also urge that the Nation honor the memory of this most distinguished citizen by observing an official period of mourning and that our National flag be lowered across the land out of respect for his martyrdom.

Such a step would indicate that we of the white so-called establishment grieve over this murder as much as do any of our fellow citizens.

I know how deeply I grieve over this senseless murder, and I extend all my sympathy and sorrow to Mrs. King and the whole of Dr. King's family.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, more than any other man in this Nation's history Martin Luther King brought the Negro to America's conscience. He became the visible of the invisible men. It took a man of unquestioned courage and conviction, a man of irreproachable character, a man of unmatched eloquence, a man of God to first confront us with the racism and repression in our own country.

Martin Luther King led his people to new self-respect. Like Moses, he was a man with a vision of the promised land. Moses at the close of his life stood on a mountaintop and looked upon the better land he had envisioned. To Moses, scripture says, the Lord spoke, saying:

I have let you see it with your own eyes, but you shall not go over there.

Alluding to these words two nights ago in Memphis, King spoke:

It doesn't matter with me because I've been to the mountain top . . . I may not get there with you, but I want you to know tonight that we as a people will get to the promised land.

Martin Luther King died in his fight to make men free. The foremost proponent of a nonviolent confrontation between the races is dead. His generosity to the white man, his belief in the basic good will of all men, and his dramatic, nonviolent action enabled him to speak to both races. His death, strangely, vindicates the black nationalists. Now we are confronted with increasing militancy, with lessening tolerance.

This day of mourning for him brings to a climax history's sweep through a

decade—from early years of hope for an integrated America to this year of self-consuming rage. In 1963 Martin Luther King spoke for the country from the Lincoln Memorial: "I have a dream," a dream of racial brotherhood, of a nation where Americans are judged not "by the color of their skin but by the content of their character." Last month the dream seemed farther from reality than ever when the Riot Commission warned, "Our Nation is moving toward two societies, one black, one white—separate and unequal."

King himself, speaking here in Washington on Sunday, and despairing the response of white Americans and of Congress to programs for the poor, warned:

We cannot afford to remain asleep. There are two challenges to America. The challenges are racism and poverty.

We can pray today that the death of the nonviolent leader will not bring violence to life. In the days ahead we must act to fulfill King's dream.

A sick white American yesterday conceded and admitted the argument of the black militants—the argument that white America is basically dishonest and indecent. It is up to the Congress today to lend powerful support to the argument of black moderates by immediately passing the 1968 civil rights bill, and by moving quickly to provide employment and housing opportunities for all blacks and whites. Last night on nationwide television, Whitney Young told the Nation that moderate black leadership has suffered by this deed a grave setback—and that the response today cannot come from black moderates. It must come from white America—and the representatives of white America in the Congress.

It may, indeed, be too late for white America—too late to peacefully and calmly repair the hideous destruction to man and spirit wrought by a hundred years of slavery and discrimination. But that should no longer be our guiding principle.

We can only move now by doing what is right.

Even talk and speeches of regret—however genuine—are insufficient. We need to keep faith with our black brothers in the same way that Martin Luther King kept constant faith with white America. In the midst of the most outrageous violence and brutality, Martin Luther King constantly reminded his followers that there were masses of decent white people who would rise up to give blacks their rights and equality.

He gave to white America a presumption of innocence and good faith. But the burden has now shifted—on our heads is a terrible presumption of guilt and inhumanity, which we can erase only by deeds, not words. By legislation, not speeches. And by programs, not talk of calm and good will.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, last night Martin Luther King was assassinated by a bullet of racial bigotry and intolerance. When he fell, a great Christian fell and a great American died. Martin Luther King lived the teachings of Christ, and taught the teachings of Christ; and his-

tory will record that he made a great contribution to the destiny of our country in a time of great crisis.

In 1964, he was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize for his work in civil rights, and for his dedication to bringing peace between and among the races in our country; but Martin Luther King has also been a great leader in the peace movement in our country in respect to the need for great changes in American foreign policy, to the end that that policy would be a more effective instrumentality for producing peace around the world rather than war.

At the time of the great march on Washington, I was one of four Senators who sat throughout the ceremony at Lincoln's monument. In fact, the four of us literally sat at the feet of Martin Luther King, for we sat on the step of the monument just below the podium from which he made that great speech that will go down in the history of American rhetoric as one of the great orations of our times.

In the course of that speech, he uttered the following paragraphs, which I wish to quote today because I know of no greater tribute that could be paid to this great American than the inspiration of his own words, when he said:

I say to you today, my friends, even though we face the difficulties of today and tomorrow, I still have a dream. It is a dream deeply rooted in the American dream. I have a dream that one day this nation will rise up and live out the true meaning of its creed: "We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal."

I have a dream that one day on the red hills of Georgia the sons of former slaves and the sons of former slaveowners will be able to sit down together at the table of brotherhood.

I have a dream that one day even the State of Mississippi, a state sweltering with the heat of injustice, sweltering with the heat of oppression, will be transformed into an oasis of freedom and justice. I have a dream that my four little children will one day live in a nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their character. I have a dream today.

I have a dream that one day down in Alabama with its vicious racists, with its Governor having his lips dripping with the words of interposition and nullification—one day right there in Alabama, little black boys and black girls will be able to join hands with little white boys and white girls as sisters and brothers.

I have a dream today.

I have a dream that one day every valley shall be exalted, every hill and mountain shall be made low, the rough places will be made plain and the crooked places will be made straight, and the glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together.

This is our hope. This is the faith that I go back to the South with. With this faith we will be able to hew out of the mountain of despair a stone of hope. With this faith we will be able to transform the jangling discords of our nation into a beautiful symphony of brotherhood. With this faith we will be able to work together, to pray together, to struggle together, to go to jail together, to stand up for freedom together, knowing that we will be free one day.

He left us the heritage of that dream. He left us the responsibility, as free men and women across this country, to see to it that the realization for which he

prayed, worked, and fought shall become the policy of the Republic. That, I think, is the essence of the dream that he left with us to carry forward into reality.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed for not to exceed 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I rise today to express a great sorrow at what happened yesterday in Memphis. It need not have happened, and it should not have happened. For to take the life of a human being, except in self-defense or in the defense of others, is an awful thing to comprehend. Life comes to man, not of himself, and once it is taken away it cannot be returned again. Yet, since Cain slew his brother Abel, man has continued to violate God's law and take that which he cannot restore. Daily, everywhere, throughout the land, men die at the hands of other men. Here in the Capital of the Nation, women are made widows, and children are made orphans, because human life is taken by the gunman or the knife wielder. And only when the victim is an individual of rank, or station, or title, or broad reputation, does the Nation mourn. Yet, one life is just as precious as is any other, and death's sorrow is just as real to the loved ones of the policeman or the fireman or the young secretary whose life has been cruelly and brutally snatched away as it is to the home of the famous or the home of the great.

The Commandment says, "Thou shalt not kill," but man defies and violates God's law daily throughout the land, and man violated God's law yesterday in Memphis.

If we would only learn to cherish and live according to God's commandments and the laws of the land, ours would be a better country and a greater country and many a home would be spared of grief.

Mr. President, I was not an admirer of Dr. Martin Luther King, but I regret, as much as any Senator regrets, the tragedy that befell him, and I feel sorrow for his family. I was shocked but I was not surprised at what happened, because of the tension that existed in Memphis. Now it has happened, and it is a tragic thing. I fear that bad matters may only be made worse, that old hatreds may be rekindled, new hatreds may be born, more blood may be spilled, and more lives may be taken.

Why, Mr. President, cannot our people revere and respect and obey the laws of the country which gave most of us birth and which we all should love?

There is a lesson to be drawn from what happened in Memphis and from what has been happening with increasing intensity throughout the Nation in recent years. That is, that mass protests, mass demonstrations, and mass marches and the like—whether labeled nonviolent or otherwise—can only serve to encourage unrest and disorder, and to provoke violence and bloodshed.

And, in the end, those who advocate such methods often become, themselves, the victims of the forces they themselves have set in motion.

This, in a manner, is what happened to Dr. King. He usually spoke of non-violence. Yet, violence all too often attended his actions. And, at the last, he himself met a violent end.

There are those who will believe that his death in Memphis was for a just cause. Yet, even in fighting for a just cause, one must pursue his course with reason, with due regard for the public welfare and good order, and with due respect for the law.

Dr. King must have known that, rioting having erupted from last week's attempted march in Memphis, there was, in its wake, such an atmosphere of tension as to make his presence in that city dangerous to himself and to others, at least for the time being. He must have known that the situation was volatile, and that passions had become greatly inflamed.

Yet, I regret he persisted in his course, continued to exhort his following to renew the march next week, and told the cheering audiences that a Federal court injunction would be ignored. "We're not going to let any injunction turn us around," he said, according to press reports.

Mr. President, no man can determine for himself whether or not a court injunction is legal or illegal, constitutional or unconstitutional. To do so would be to take the law unto one's own hands.

Justice Frankfurter said:

If one man can be allowed to determine for himself what is law, every man can. That means, first, chaos, then tyranny.

Mr. President, one cannot preach non-violence and, at the same time, advocate defiance of the law, whether it be a court order, a municipal ordinance, or a State or Federal statute. For to defy the law is to invite violence, especially in a tense atmosphere involving many hundreds or thousands of people. To invite violence is to endanger one's own life. And one cannot live dangerously always.

Paul said, in his Epistle to the Romans:

Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers.

He said, in his Epistle to Titus:

Put them in mind to be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates, to be ready to every good work.

And he said, in his second Epistle to the Thessalonians:

Now, we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly.

Thus, we are exhorted to obey the law and to respect authority, Mr. President, and those who refuse to do this cause serious risks to themselves and to others.

The words of Proverbs are as true today as they were in the day of King Solomon, who is thought to have written them:

Whoso keepeth the law is a wise son; but he that is a companion of riotous men shameth his father.

Dr. King's profession was that of a minister. But no man is required to be a member of the clergy to be able to read and to understand these simple passages from the scriptures, and all men would profit from obedience thereto.

This is an hour of great emotion throughout the land, Mr. President, and it is an hour of shame and remorse and sorrow.

But it should also be a time for sober reflection by all citizens.

And out of this moment should come a spirit of rededication to the principles of equal justice for every man, whatever his race, and a reawakening of respect for law and order on the part of every man, whatever his race.

Neither men nor mobs can continue to create disorder and disregard the laws and disrupt the orderly functioning of government at any level, without shaking the very foundations of our society, tearing our country asunder, and destroying themselves in the end.

We must, if we are to avoid disaster, strive to live in peace, work together in harmony, seek redress for our grievances through established legal processes, and strive always for the preservation of good order.

This, I hope, will be the lesson we will all draw from the tragic events of recent days in Memphis.

Mr. President, this, as I have said, is a time of deep emotion. We may have on our hands a highly flammable situation in which passions will determine events of the day. What I am saying is difficult to say at a time like this, it may be misinterpreted by some, and it may not be considered entirely in keeping with the views being expressed by many, but I feel constrained to make this call to reason—in the hope that the reactions of all our people may be influenced by careful thought of what is needed to steer the Nation through this confused and troubled period.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, George Bernard Shaw wrote:

Some men see things as they are and ask why. I see things that have never been and ask why not.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., was a man who asked why not. His assassination is a sad, sad, sorrowful thing, but not only for his family. It is, Mr. President, a great American tragedy.

It is tragically ironic that a man who dedicated his life to the concept of non-violence should himself be stricken down by violence.

Mr. President, Dr. King adhered faithfully all his life to the concept of nonviolence, and if his life and death are to have their greatest meaning, all Americans, black and white, must now renew their dedication to that principle.

He also stood for an equally great concept, the concept of hope. Throughout all his life, Dr. King, by his words and his acts, exemplified an abiding hope and confidence in the American system, a deep and abiding hope and confidence in the reservoir of goodness which has always existed in this country. He never faltered in his belief that justice would triumph for all people and that America

would soon commence to live up to its highest ideals.

Mr. President, at a time such as this, each of us in America must pause and take a hard and painful look at ourselves and resolve to remove from our lives, and from the life of our Nation, the ugliness which makes one man less than another.

As we view the surging events of our turbulent generation, we must almost want to cry out with Hamlet:

The time is out of joint: O cursed spite, That ever I was born to set it right!

But we, Mr. President, who serve in this Chamber, were born to set it right. The way is clear. And set it right we must.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the great poet Goethe once said:

Nothing is more terrible than ignorance in action.

The senseless and cowardly assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., has robbed America of a brave and dedicated citizen.

The causes of freedom, individual dignity, human compassion, and decency have suffered immeasurably.

As a demonstration of the profound grief which is felt throughout this country today, I urge the President of the United States to officially proclaim a week of national mourning.

I also implore my colleagues in the House of Representatives to approve the civil rights protection bill, which was passed overwhelmingly by the Senate last month.

Martin Luther King will remain an inspiration for all Americans. His beliefs and convictions will triumph over the warped thinking of bigots and racists, and those few who are infected by their venom.

I pray that the shock of this tragic event will bring all Americans closer together, rather than destroying all reason.

All men of good will must now join, without hesitation, in fighting the battle which Dr. King fought so unselfishly for us. His vision of nonviolence and justice must not be allowed to fade.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, our land has been visited once again by the senseless violence of an assassin. All men of good will, I know, are shocked and saddened by the murder of Dr. Martin Luther King, the apostle of nonviolence and world-recognized advocate of peace. He has died a violent death.

Mr. President, at a time such as this, recriminations are easy. Violence so easily begets violence. Vengeance is a natural instinct. Recrimination, violence, and vengeance, however, were not the ways of the Rev. Martin Luther King. In this sad hour, Mr. President, we must hope and pray that this gospel of peace and nonviolence will prevail in the face of the tragedy which has taken his life. Martin Luther King had a dream. It was about the brotherhood of man, but more specifically about the brotherhood of all Americans. It cannot be achieved by violence on either side of the so-called color line, but only by a determination to live up to our beliefs and be truly men of good

will. The achievement of that dream is the only fitting memorial to the leader of men who was struck down so cowardly and so senselessly in Memphis last night. I join my colleagues in expressing a sense of deep regret and grief to Dr. King's widow and family, to his colleagues in the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, and to the millions of Americans of all races who mourn his death.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., was a despicable and cowardly act. I extend my deepest sympathy to the members of his family.

Crime and mob violence and the fear of crime and mob violence has been the most serious domestic problem in our Nation for several years. If our country is to remain strong and free with liberty and justice for all, crime and mob violence and insane acts such as the one last night must cease.

Unless reasonable men, of both races and all political persuasions, prevail in these trying times, I fear for the future safety of this great Nation. I pray that reason will prevail so that all our people can work together for solutions to our common problems.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, the assassination of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., is a great national tragedy. America has lost one of her greatest civil rights leaders and our Negro citizens a real champion.

Dr. King held steadfastly to the belief that gains in human rights could be achieved without violence. He preached nonviolence vigorously and with great conviction.

He was a leading major force in the drive to improve the lot of the Negro in education, housing, fair employment, voting rights, and equal access to public facilities and accommodations.

Now we must be more determined than ever to eliminate the blight of racial discrimination from all aspects of American life and redouble our efforts to achieve the goal of full equality and freedom for all Americans.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, last night, for the second time in 5 years, a giant among us was cut down by a lunatic's bullet. Dr. Martin Luther King, man of God, man of peace, man of enormous courage and leadership, is dead. Let us pray for his soul and for the spirit of justice and nonviolence through which he accomplished so much.

This is no time for more violence or more hate. The world has grown much too small for injustice, much too small for hate.

We may never be able to eliminate the kind of madness which struck down Dr. King, but we have no excuse for hatred or callousness to the condition of our fellow man. Congress has it in its power to act against the ignorance, poverty, ill-housing, and bad health which afflicts many of our citizens in all parts of this Nation. Congress must act.

In a few years of his life, Dr. King achieved far more through nonviolence than all hate's black apostles could dream of or hate's white apostles could stop.

Dr. King's militant appeal to reason,

love, and justice produced the Civil Rights Act, the Voting Rights Act, and scores of breakthroughs for justice and decency in cities and States across the Nation. May his death not be in vain. Let every American renounce hate and violence and rededicate himself to justice and decency for every citizen.

Mr. President, I ask that the editorials appearing in today's Baltimore Sun, Washington Post, and New York Times commemorating Dr. King's life and achievements be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Apr. 5, 1968]

MARTIN LUTHER KING

The killing of Martin Luther King is a national tragedy, the consequences of which are not readily foreseeable. His was the voice of inspiration for millions of American Negroes. His was the marching figure of undaunted insistence on individual rights and respect. From the 1955 days of the Montgomery (Ala.) bus boycott, his was the stride toward freedom that remained unbroken and drew an impressive following while others faltered or flamed out and went off in diverse directions.

White resentment of Dr. King and at times overt hostility accompanied his every move. Even those in full sympathy with what he was trying to do had occasion to question his tactics. But now that he lies dead there must come the overwhelming realization that there was none other of his stature, that here was a man committed to a Gandhian principle of non-violent, passive resistance who again and again demonstrated that social changes could be brought about through peaceful means. His voice is needed today, and it will be needed tomorrow, but it has been brutally still.

The nation can only wonder anxiously what voices will take Dr. King's place. If his truths march on as he would have wanted them to, the voices will be those of moderation and they will be answered in kind at each point of resistance against which he struggled.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 5, 1968]

A CRUEL AND WANTON ACT

Martin Luther King is the victim of a cruel and wanton act that will be deplored from one end of this country to the other. There is about this assault upon the great Negro leader the same kind of wanton senselessness that overtook the man whose tactics he emulated—Mahatma Gandhi. Men of good will, noble purpose and pacific impulses enjoy no immunity from violence, no matter how they shun it in their personal conduct.

Those who are responsible for this vile deed have killed an unoffending, God-fearing and innocent man of great goodwill; they have also killed something in the spirit and heart of the American people where lived the bright hope for reconciliation between the races.

That hope will be resurrected, because it cannot be utterly extinguished even by so wanton and dastardly a deed. It is possible to kill men like Martin Luther King, but the ideas for which they stand are not mortal or destructible. Americans of Negro and white descent alike, of all races and of all creeds, will gather around the principles that he espoused and carry his message to the multitudes.

The dream of which he spoke so eloquently at the Lincoln Memorial in 1963 must seem tonight, to many of his sorrowing countrymen and embittered fellow citizens, farther than ever from fulfillment. But that shining

vision and bright hope will yet prevail. It must be our resolve to go forward with a greater sense of urgency to make a reality of his dream of racial equality and social justice.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 5, 1968]

"THE NEED OF ALL HUMANITY"

The assassin's bullet that extinguished the life of Dr. King has struck deep into the fabric of this country and has torn into the fiber of every American of every race, color and creed. Each one of us has died a little with the death of Martin Luther King, who recently wrote:

"Nonviolence, the answer to the Negro's need, may become the answer to the most desperate need of all humanity."

Dr. King's murder is a national disaster, depriving Negroes and whites alike of a leader of integrity, vision and restraint. The calamity of his loss will require a maximum of self-control and steadiness of nerve on the part of all the American people.

The cause for which Dr. King died will find renewed strength and purpose in the inspiration of his memory, and it will surely triumph, for the cause is just.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a great American has fallen. The loss is not that of race or sect, but of the Nation.

Who among us will ever forget that powerful day in August when hundreds of thousands of Americans converged on the Lincoln Memorial in peace, to be profoundly moved by Martin Luther King's vision of the American dream.

It was his dream "that my four little children will one day live in a nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their character." With moral force, not armed force, he made a nation face its conscience.

We must draw strength and moral commitment from his life.

We must build toward his dream for our country or face the nightmare of society at war with itself.

It is fitting that we remember Dr. Martin Luther King as he stood before the great statue of Lincoln, for he came among us to redeem Lincoln's own pledge to his people; he fell as Lincoln fell and he becomes, as Lincoln became, an inspiration for the world.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, it was a tragic and senseless murder. Dr. King personified the conviction that nonviolence could bring effective redress of ancient wrongs and present grievances. It is a bitter thing for all Americans that his dream of America should be shattered by a coward's bullet.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, Martin Luther King was an eloquent advocate of nonviolence in a world often torn apart by violence and ill will. In his own way he sought to bring peace and brotherhood to a world beset by war and racial conflict. He saw clearly that the violence abroad was in fact closely linked to the violence which we suffer at home. He was among those who spoke up and declared that we as a nation must face up to the facts of life and that we cannot continue to pour billions of dollars into the machinery of war abroad while cutting down the budget for the machinery of projects of peace

at home. The issue he joined was this: Just where do our priorities lie? Is it more important to kill Vietcong in South Vietnam or to save the embittered poor in our own country? Is it more important to bomb Vietnam's cities into rubble or to reconstruct our own? Is it more important to involve ourselves in a revolutionary war in Vietnam or to prevent a revolutionary war at home?

There is a time to mourn but there is also a time to build. Our thoughts are with the dead, but our actions must be with the living to meet their needs and to fulfill the legacy of Martin Luther King.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I want to join my colleagues in paying tribute to a great moderate leader who advanced the causes of equality and justice for all men. It is a tremendous tragedy that such a man should die in a country where he fought so valiantly to preserve order and equal rights for all Americans.

I think the brutal, senseless, cowardly killing of the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., illustrates the danger of extremism, in whatever form, or wherever found, to the American ideal that Dr. King sought to advance. Death of leaders is not progress, nor is it a halt to the steady spread of the great truths they teach and proclaim. Most of us learned this on the death of our beloved President, John F. Kennedy.

May the death of Dr. King serve as a reminder that there is much work to be done to achieve the free society of all men.

HATE REAPS ANOTHER VICTIM

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, victim of an assassin's bullet, Dr. Martin Luther King lies dead today. Victim of the racial strife which has permeated this country for many scores of years, a great man is mourned today. Victim of the violence which taints the spirit of this country, one more voice of reason has been silenced forever.

I sat in shocked disbelief, Mr. President, when news of Dr. King's death reached me last evening. Yet now I realize that there should have been no shock; I should not have been incredulous. Only one hate-filled man is required to snuff out the life of a dozen or more good men. And not just Memphis, but New York, San Francisco, Detroit, Newark, Selma, Little Rock, Baltimore, Washington, and cities stretched across the length and breadth of this land of ours, are filled with countless numbers of hate-filled people. They hate Catholics and Jews; Negroes and Indians; the Italian immigrant and the Irish. They hate the French and the Communists. They hate and hate and hate. The objects of their hatred are legion; their victims, often unknown except on such dramatic occasions as this. No, Mr. President, I should not have been surprised. Enough hate-mongers roam this land to strike down a Martin Luther King or any other real or imagined object of their hate. But this realization does not diminish the overpowering sadness, my deep distress, the terrible grief I share with Dr. King's family and friends. Their loss is the Nation's loss, and a grievous loss it is.

Let us pray that Dr. King's death will bring the beginning of the fulfillment of the dream of which he spoke so eloquently that bright August day in 1963. Let us hope that this generation of Americans begins now to realize that hatred begets hatred, that violence breeds violence, that intolerance, injustice, inequality, and all the other evils which plague our society do it almost irreparable harm.

Let us pray, Mr. President, that Dr. King's children and the children of oppressed people through this land shall be able to live in an America which has attained the ideal toward which it has striven for 200 years. The question is not Negro rights, Indian rights, or minority rights of any kind. The question is: Are we ever going to grant to all Americans those inalienable rights for which so much blood has already been shed in this country? For that cause, Dr. King has now become victim to this national bloodletting. How many more victims there will be before it ends, I dare not think.

Mrs. King and her family have lost a good husband and father. The Negro people have lost one of the greatest leaders of our time. This Nation mourns an outstanding American whose life was an example to us all. May we emulate that example.

ACT TO REPLACE SLUMS AS TRIBUTE TO MARTIN LUTHER KING

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, I join with all my colleagues in expressing my most profound sorrow over the events which transpired last night. Dr. King was a great man and will be sorely missed. However, life goes on and the greatest memorial we can contribute to his memory is to continue to work toward the complete equality of white and Negro through nonviolent means.

One of the ways in which we can act, and act now, is to make sure that the slum dwellers, many of whom are Negro, have fit places to live.

The passage of my bill, S. 3234, should dramatically increase the number of repairs slumlords would make on their properties, while dramatically decreasing the time it takes these slumlords to make these repairs required by law.

As I pointed out on Wednesday and Thursday, many of the slum properties are owned by a few large slumlords who make immense profits on the properties because of the many tax advantages afforded landlords under the Internal Revenue Code. The largest tax advantage is the depreciation deduction which shelters from taxation large portions of the income these slumlords receive. If slumlords were threatened with the loss of this deduction if they failed to maintain their properties in the minimal fashion required by law, they would surely make the required repairs within the time allowed by law. No longer would they be able to hide behind crowded court dockets and be willing to risk the light fines imposed by most courts for violating the housing codes. The penalty for violating housing codes would be drastically increased. This would affect primarily the slumlords, not the majority

of landlords who are careful to maintain their property in good repair.

Another great benefit from the passage of S. 3234 would be that it could be effective now without the expenditure of vast sums of money we cannot afford to spend.

We must act now. The terrible tragedy that occurred last night should be a lesson to us all. The senseless rioting that occurred last night, right here in our Nation's Capital, indicates the deep undercurrent of resentment festering within ghetto dwellers because of their living conditions. Let us act now to alleviate some of the problems facing them and help carry out Dr. King's movement toward equality in a non-violent fashion.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I am stunned by the brutal assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King. That such a sick and wanton killing can occur in a civilized society fills me with sorrow, and anger, and shame.

Dr. King's death is a tragic loss for his family, for his people, for the Nation, and for the world.

To Mrs. King and her grief-stricken family, I extend my condolences and prayers. To the Negro people whom he led with understanding and effectiveness, I offer my heartfelt sympathies for the loss of a great leader. And to citizens everywhere I express my hope that reason and compassion will prevail in a time of anguish and despair.

The death of Dr. King will affect the lives of every one of us. To the downtrodden, the poor, the victims of discrimination, the loss is especially grievous. For Dr. King represented hope and courage and the vision of a new America brightened by the reconciliation of black and white, rich and poor.

This vision cannot die with one man. What he has set in motion is far greater than a single bullet, a single wanton act, a single blemish on the march toward human equality.

The Birmingham boycott, The march on Washington, Selma, and Montgomery. These are more than names and events. They are symbols which have altered the course of history, touched a nation's conscience, and pointed a path to a stronger future compatible with historic ideals of American society.

Dr. Martin Luther King is dead. Let us make a declaration that his cause and unswerving dedication to nonviolence did not cease with yesterday's events. Let all Americans, white and black, resolve together the differences that regrettably have kept us apart.

Let this Congress fulfill its obligations to rectify the inequities and the wrongs that still persist through this land.

Let America's tribute to him be the realization in our lifetime of the dream of brotherhood. Let the memory of his martyrdom be the renewed dedication to his philosophy of nonviolence as the instrument of constructive change. And let history record that his entire life and death, his sufferings and unshakeable belief in this Nation and its people, shall not be for naught. No greater tribute can stand for any man.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I was

shocked and saddened by the senseless killing in Memphis last night of Dr. Martin Luther King. And I am sure that this was the reaction of every American citizen worthy of the name.

Like all crusaders, Dr. King had his critics. But not even his critics can deny that he made a truly outstanding contribution to the cause of civil rights and that, to the bitter end, in the face of many threats of violence, he remained as unyielding as Ghandi in his commitment to nonviolence.

No one who lived through the great march on Washington in 1963 will ever be able to forget Dr. King's impassioned vision of a greater and better America—of an America governed by social justice and brotherhood and racial harmony.

I can think of no more effective way of honoring the memory of Dr. Martin Luther King than redoubling our efforts to achieve the ideal America for which he was so eloquently a spokesman.

Dr. King's untimely death was a warning that our society cannot afford the luxury of bigotry and race hatred.

His death imposes on each one of us the moral duty to seek to overcome that which is intolerant in us; to resist the prejudices from which even good men frequently suffer; and to take those positive measures which must be taken to eliminate the serious vestiges of inequality and social injustice inherited from a tragic historic past.

One other lesson emerges from the tragedy of Dr. King's assassination.

For years now I have been fighting for a gun bill that would impose at least a modest measure of control over the sale of firearms by prohibiting the interstate mail-order sale of firearms. This measure has, regrettably, been resisted by a powerful combination in the Senate, which has been supported and encouraged by formidable lobbying interests.

President Kennedy was killed with a weapon purchased through the mails by Lee Harvey Oswald, under an assumed name.

Dr. King has now been killed with a rifle whose owner has not yet been identified.

How many more good men will have to die before public indignation compels Congress to enact the very modest gun control measure which has been pending before it for years?

How much longer will America remain the only civilized country in the world that does not have such controls?

My 5-year struggle to have my gun bill enacted into law is now in its climatic stages.

Yesterday at an executive session of the Judiciary Committee at which the administration's safe streets crime bill was being debated and voted upon, I offered my administration-backed gun bill as an amendment. After some discussion, it was rejected by a vote of 9 to 4.

Then in an effort to get the best possible gun bill reported to the Senate floor, I modified the bill so as to give any State the privilege of exempting its citizens from the long-arm provisions of the bill.

The committee still rejected the bill; this time by a vote of 8 to 5.

In a final effort to get action, I presented a modified bill that did not apply to long arms. Even with this modification we were only able to achieve a tie vote of 6 to 6.

The four absent Senators are now being polled to determine their position on the gun bill, as amended.

I am hopeful that the final vote will be favorable and that it will thus pave the way for the entire Senate to have an opportunity to work its will on this gun bill.

THE DEATH OF A DREAM

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, today is a sad day for all America and the world. A man who believed in peace and the brotherhood of man was brutally slain in Memphis last night because he dared to carry his views where they were unpopular.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., was a passionate apostle of the nonviolent method of carrying forward the civil rights movement for Negro equality. In the end, it was this passion which destroyed him—and perhaps with him the hope for a peaceful integration of the Negro into the mainstream of American life. Unafraid of danger, welcoming challenge, always convinced of the ultimate decency of white America, Martin Luther King, Jr., lived and died with the courage of his convictions. Had he believed less intensely in his cause or had he been more of a careful politician, perhaps he would not have taken the chances he did.

Mr. President, it is too early to accurately assess the place of Dr. King in American history. That he pressed insistently for what he felt was right is far beyond question. What we must wonder now is what effect will this death have on the Negroes who shared his faith that white America is basically decent and only needed to be shown where injustice existed in order to respond. I fear that much of this faith has been shattered and that our country is facing increasing bitterness and divisiveness—an ironic legacy for a man who scorned those who preached separation.

Mr. President, the belief in us, in the ultimate justice of our democracy and in the American dream that Martin Luther King, Jr., so often and eloquently expressed must not be allowed to perish with him. Moderation must prevail and we in the Senate bear a special responsibility to insure that it does.

SHOWDOWN FOR NONVIOLENCE

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I believe that it is appropriate to place into the RECORD the article by Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., which appears in the April 16 issue of LOOK magazine. I ask unanimous consent to insert the article in today's RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHOWDOWN FOR NONVIOLENCE

(By Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.)

The policy of the Federal Government is to play Russian roulette with riots; it is prepared to gamble with another summer of disaster. Despite two consecutive summers of violence, not a single basic cause of riots has been corrected. All of the misery that stoked the flames of rage and rebellion remains undiminished. With unemployment, intolerable housing and discriminatory education a scourge in Negro ghettos, Congress and the Administration still tinker with trivial, halfhearted measures.

Yet only a few years ago, there was discernible, if limited, progress through non-violence. Each year, a wholesome vibrant Negro self-confidence was taking shape. The fact is inescapable that the tactic of non-violence, which had then dominated the thinking of the civil-rights movement, has in the last two years not been playing its transforming role. Non-violence was a creative doctrine in the South because it checked the rabid segregationists who were thirsting for an opportunity to physically crush Negroes. Non-violent direct action enabled the Negro to take to the streets in active protest, but it muzzled the guns of the oppressor because even he could not shoot down in daylight unarmed men, women and children. This is the reason there was less loss of life in ten years of Southern protest than in ten days of Northern riots.

Today, the Northern cities have taken on the conditions we faced in the South. Police, national guard and other armed bodies are feverishly preparing for repression. They can be curbed not by unorganized resort to force by desperate Negroes but only by a massive wave of militant non-violence. Non-violence was never more relevant as an effective tactic than today for the North. It also may be the instrument of our national salvation.

I agree with the President's National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders that our nation is splitting into two hostile societies and that the chief destructive cutting edge is white racism. We need, above all, effective means to force Congress to act resolutely—but means that do not involve the use of violence. For us in the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, violence is not only morally repugnant, it is pragmatically barren. We feel there is an alternative both to violence and to useless timid supplications for justice. We cannot condone either riots or the equivalent evil of passivity. And we know that non-violent militant action in Selma and Birmingham awakened the conscience of white America and brought a moribund, insensitive Congress to life.

The time has come for a return to mass non-violent protest. Accordingly, we are planning a series of such demonstrations this spring and summer, to begin in Washington, D.C. They will have Negro and white participation, and they will seek to benefit the poor of both races.

We will call on the Government to adopt the measures recommended by its own commission. To avoid, in the Commission's words, the tragedy of "continued polarization of the American community and ultimately the destruction of basic democratic values," we must have "national action—compassionate, massive and sustained, backed by the resources of the most powerful and the richest nation on earth."

The demonstrations we have planned are of deep concern to me, and I want to spell out at length what we will do, try to do, and believe in. My staff and I have worked three months on the planning. We believe that if this campaign succeeds, non-violence will once again be the dominant instrument for social change—and jobs and income will be put in the hands of the tormented poor. If it fails, non-violence will be discredited, and the

country may be plunged into holocaust—a tragedy deepened by the awareness that it was avoidable.

We are taking action after sober reflection. We have learned from bitter experience that our Government does not correct a race problem until it is confronted directly and dramatically. We also know, as official Washington may not, that the flash point of Negro rage is close at hand.

Our Washington demonstration will resemble Birmingham and Selma in duration. It will be more than a one-day protest—it can persist for two or three months. In the earlier Alabama actions, we set no time limits. We simply said we were going to struggle there until we got a response from the nation on the issues involved. We are saying the same thing about Washington. This will be an attempt to bring a kind of Selma-like movement, Birmingham-like movement, into being, substantially around the economic issues. Just as we dealt with the social problem of segregation through massive demonstrations, we are now trying to deal with the economic problems—the right to live, to have a job and income—through massive protest. It will be a Selma-like movement on economic issues.

We remember that when we began direct action in Birmingham and Selma, there was a thunderous chorus that sought to discourage us. Yet today, our achievements in these cities and the reforms that radiated from them are hailed with pride by all.

We've selected 15 areas—ten cities and five rural districts—from which we have recruited our initial cadre. We will have 200 poor people from each area. That would be about 3,000 to get the protests going and set the pattern. They are important, particularly in terms of maintaining non-violence. They are being trained in this discipline now.

In areas where we are recruiting, we are also stimulating activities in conjunction with the Washington protest. We are planning to have some of these people march to Washington. We may have half the group from Mississippi, for example, go to Washington and begin the protest there, while the other half begins walking. They would flow across the South, joining the Alabama group, the Georgia group, right on up through South and North Carolina and Virginia. We hope that the sound and sight of a growing mass of poor people walking slowly toward Washington will have a positive, dramatic effect on Congress.

Once demonstrations start, we feel, there will be spontaneous supporting activity taking place across the country. This has usually happened in campaigns like this, and I think it will again. I think people will start moving. The reasons we didn't choose California and other areas out West are distance and the problem of transporting marchers that far. But part of our strategy is to have spontaneous demonstrations take place on the West Coast.

A nationwide non-violent movement is very important. We know from past experience that Congress and the President won't do anything until you develop a movement around which people of goodwill can find a way to put pressure on them, because it really means breaking that coalition in Congress. It's still a coalition-dominated, rural-dominated, basically Southern Congress. There are Southerners there with committee chairmanships, and they are going to stand in the way of progress as long as they can. They get enough right-wing Midwestern or Northern Republicans to go along with them.

This really means making the movement powerful enough, dramatic enough, morally appealing enough, so that people of goodwill, the churches, labor, liberals, intellectuals, students, poor people themselves begin to put pressure on congressmen to the point that they can no longer elude our demands.

Our idea is to dramatize the whole economic problem of the poor. We feel there's a great deal that we need to do to appeal to Congress itself. The early demonstrations will be more geared toward educational purposes—to educate the nation on the nature of the problem and the crucial aspects of it, the tragic conditions that we confront in the ghettos.

After that, if we haven't gotten a response from Congress, we will branch out. And we are honest enough to feel that we aren't going to get any instantaneous results from Congress, knowing its recalcitrant nature on this issue, and knowing that so many resources and energies are being used in Vietnam rather than on the domestic situation. So we don't have any illusions about moving Congress in two or three weeks. But we do feel that, by starting in Washington, centering on Congress and departments of the Government, we will be able to do a real educational job.

We call our demonstration a campaign for jobs and income because we feel that the economic question is the most crucial that black people, and poor people generally, are confronting. There is a literal depression in the Negro community. When you have mass unemployment in the Negro community, it's called a social problem; when you have mass unemployment in the white community, it's called a depression. The fact is, there is a major depression in the Negro community. The unemployment rate is extremely high, and among Negro youth, it goes up as high as 40 percent in some cities.

We need an Economic Bill of Rights. This would guarantee a job to all people who want to work and are able to work. It would also guarantee an income for all who are not able to work. Some people are too young, some are too old, some are physically disabled, and yet in order to live, they need income. It would mean creating certain public-service jobs, but that could be done in a few weeks. A program that would really deal with jobs could minimize—I don't say stop—the number of riots that could take place this summer.

Our whole campaign, therefore, will center on the job question, with other demands, like housing, that are closely tied to it. We feel that much more building of housing for low-income people should be done. On the educational front, the ghetto schools are in bad shape in terms of quality, and we feel that a program should be developed to spend at least a thousand dollars per pupil. Often, they are so far behind that they need more and special attention, the best quality education that can be given.

These problems, of course, are overshadowed by the Vietnam war. We'll focus on the domestic problems, but it's inevitable that we've got to bring out the question of the tragic mix-up in priorities. We are spending all of this money for death and destruction, and not nearly enough money for life and constructive development. It's inevitable that the question of the war will come up in this campaign. We hear all this talk about our ability to afford guns and butter, but we have come to see that this is a myth of war, when the guns of war become a national obsession, social needs inevitably suffer. And we hope that as a result of our trying to dramatize this and getting thousands and thousands of people moving around this issue, that our Government will be forced to reevaluate its policy abroad in order to deal with the domestic situation.

The American people are more sensitive than Congress. A Louis Harris poll has revealed that 56 percent of the people feel that some kind of program should come into being to provide jobs to all who want to work. We had the WPA when the nation was on the verge of bankruptcy; we should be able to do something when we're sick with wealth. That poll also showed that 57

percent of the people felt the slums should be eradicated and the communities rebuilt by those who live in them, which would be a massive job program.

We need to put pressure on Congress to get things done. We will do this with First Amendment activity. If Congress is unresponsive, we'll have to escalate in order to keep the issue alive and before it. This action may take on disruptive dimensions, but not violent in the sense of destroying life or property: it will be militant non-violence.

We really feel that riots tend to intensify the fears of the white majority while relieving its guilt, and so open the door to greater repression. We've seen no changes in Watts, no structural changes have taken place as the result of riots. We are trying to find an alternative that will force people to confront issues without destroying life or property. We plan to build a shantytown in Washington, patterned after the bonus marches of the thirties, to dramatize how many people have to live in slums in our nation. But essentially, this will be just like our other non-violent demonstrations. We are not going to tolerate violence. And we are making it very clear that the demonstrators who are not prepared to be nonviolent should not participate in this. For the past six weeks, we've had workshops on non-violence with the people who will be going to Washington. They will continue through the spring. These people will form a core of the demonstration and will later be the marshals in the protests. They will be participating themselves in the early stages, but after two or three weeks, when we will begin to call larger numbers in, they will be the marshals, the ones who will control and discipline all of the demonstrations.

We plan to have a march for those who can spend only a day or two in Washington, and that will be toward the culminating point of the campaign. I hope this will be a time when white people will rejoin the ranks of the movement.

Demonstrations have served as unifying forces in the movement; they have brought blacks and whites together in very practical situations, where philosophically they may have been arguing about Black Power. It's a strange thing how demonstrations tend to solve problems. The other thing is that it's little known that crime rates go down in almost every community where you have demonstrations. In Montgomery, Ala., when we had a bus boycott, the crime rate in the Negro community went down 65 percent for a whole year. Anytime we've had demonstrations in a community, people have found a way to slough off their self-hatred, and they have had a channel to express their longings and a way to fight non-violently—to get at the power structure, to know you're doing something, so you don't have to be violent to do it.

We need this movement. We need it to bring about a new kind of togetherness between blacks and whites. We need it to bring allies together and to bring the coalition of conscience together.

A good number of white people have given up on integration too. There are a lot of "White Power" advocates, and I find that people do tend to despair and engage in debates when nothing is going on. But when action is taking place, when there are demonstrations, they have a quality about them that leads to a unity you don't achieve at other times.

I think we have come to the point where there is no longer a choice now between non-violence and riots. It must be militant, massive non-violence, or riots. The discontent is so deep, the anger so ingrained, the despair, the restlessness so wide, that something has to be brought into being to serve as a channel through which these deep emotional feelings, these deep angry feelings, can be funneled. There has to be an outlet, and I see

this campaign as a way to transmute the inchoate rage of the ghetto into a constructive and creative channel. It becomes an outlet for anger.

Even if I didn't deal with the moral dimensions and question of violence versus non-violence, from a practical point of view, I don't see riots working. But I am convinced that if rioting continues, it will strengthen the right wing of the country, and we'll end up with a kind of right-wing take-over in the cities and a Fascist development, which will be terribly injurious to the whole nation. I don't think America can stand another summer of Detroit-like riots without a development that could destroy the soul of the nation, and even the democratic possibilities of the nation.

I'm committed to non-violence absolutely. I'm just not going to kill anybody, whether it's in Vietnam or here. I'm not going to burn down any building. If non-violent protest fails this summer, I will continue to preach it and teach it, and we at the Southern Christian Leadership Conference will still do this. I plan to stand by non-violence because I have found it to be a philosophy of life that regulates not only my dealings in the struggle for racial justice but also my dealings with people, with my own self. I will still be faithful to non-violence.

But I'm frank enough to admit that if our non-violent campaign doesn't generate some progress, people are just going to engage in more violent activity, and the discussion of guerrilla warfare will be more extensive.

In any event, we will not have been the ones who will have failed. We will place the problems of the poor at the seat of government of the wealthiest nation in the history of mankind. If that power refuses to acknowledge its debt to the poor, it will have failed to live up to its promise to insure "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness" to its citizens.

If this society fails, I fear that we will learn very shortly that racism is a sickness unto death.

We welcome help from all civil-rights organizations. There must be a diversified approach to the problem, and I think both the NAACP and the Urban League play a significant role. I also feel that CORE and SNCC have played very significant roles. I think SNCC's recent conclusions are unfortunate. We have not given up on integration. We still believe in black and white together. Some of the Black Power groups have temporarily given up on integration. We have not. So maybe we are the bridge, in the middle, reaching across and connecting both sides.

The fact is, we have not had any insurrection in the United States because an insurrection is planned, organized, violent rebellion. What we have had is a kind of spontaneous explosion of anger. The fact is, people who riot don't want to riot. A study was made recently by some professors at Wayne State University. They interviewed several hundred people who participated in the riot last summer in Detroit, and a majority of these people said they felt that my approach to the problem—non-violence—was the best and most effective.

I don't believe there has been a massive turn to violence. Even the riots have had an element of non-violence to persons. But for a rare exception, they haven't killed any white people, and Negroes could, if they wished, kill by the hundreds. That would be insurrection. But the amazing thing is that the Negro has vented his anger on property, not persons, even in the emotional turbulence of riots.

But I'm convinced that if something isn't done to deal with the very harsh and real economic problems of the ghetto, the talk of guerrilla warfare is going to become much more real. The nation has not yet recognized the seriousness of it. Congress hasn't been

willing to do anything about it, and this is what we're trying to face this spring. As committed as I am to non-violence, I have to face this fact: if we do not get a positive response in Washington, many more Negroes will begin to think and act in violent terms.

I hope, instead, that what comes out of these non-violent demonstrations will be an Economic Bill of Rights for the Disadvantaged, requiring about ten or twelve billion dollars. I hope that a specific number of jobs is set forth, that a program will emerge to abolish unemployment, and that there will be another program to supplement the income of those whose earnings are below the poverty level. These would be measures of success in our campaign.

It may well be that all we'll get out of Washington is to keep Congress from getting worse. The problem is to stop it from moving backward. We started out with a poverty bill at 2.4 billion dollars, and now it's back to 1.8 billion. We have a welfare program that's dehumanizing, and then Congress adds a Social Security amendment that will bar literally thousands of children from any welfare. Model cities started out; it's been cut back. Rent subsidy, an excellent program for the poor, cut down to nothing. It may be that because of these demonstrations, we will at least be able to hold on to some of the things we have.

There is an Old Testament prophecy of the "sins of the Fathers being visited upon the third and fourth generations." Nothing could be more applicable to our situation. America is reaping the harvest of hate and shame planted through generations of educational denial, political disfranchisement and economic exploitation of its black population. Now, almost a century removed from slavery, we find the heritage of oppression and racism erupting in our cities, with volcanic lava of bitterness and frustration pouring down our avenues.

Black Americans have been patient people, and perhaps they could continue patient with but a modicum of hope; but everywhere, "time is winding up," in the words of one of our spirituals, "corruption in the land, people take your stand; time is winding up." In spite of years of national progress, the plight of the poor is worsening. Jobs are on the decline as a result of technological change, schools North and South are proving themselves more and more inadequate to the task of providing adequate education and thereby entrance into the mainstream of the society. Medical care is virtually out of reach of millions of black and white poor. They are aware of the great advances of medical science—heart transplants, miracle drugs—but their children still die of preventable diseases, and even suffer brain damage due to protein deficiency.

In Mississippi, children are actually starving, while large landowners have placed their land in the soil bank and receive millions of dollars annually not to plant food and cotton. No provision is made for the life and survival of the hundreds of thousands of sharecroppers who now have no work and no food. Driven off the land, they are forced into tent cities and ghettos of the North, for our Congress is determined not to stifle the initiative of the poor (though they clamor for jobs) through welfare handouts. Handouts to the rich are given more sophisticated nomenclature such as parity, subsidies and incentives to industry.

White America has allowed itself to be indifferent to race prejudice and economic denial. It has treated them as superficial blemishes, but now awakes to the horrifying reality of a potentially fatal disease. The urban outbreaks are "a fire bell in the night," clamorously warning that the seams of our entire social order are weakening under strains of neglect.

The American people are infected with racism—that is the peril. Paradoxically, they

are also infected with democratic ideals—that is the hope. While doing wrong, they have the potential to do right. But they do not have a millennium to make changes. Nor have they a choice of continuing in the old way. The future they are asked to inaugurate is not so unpalatable that it justifies the evils that beset the nation. To end poverty, to extirpate prejudice, to free a tormented conscience, to make a tomorrow of justice, fair play and creativity—all are worthy of the American ideal.

We have, through massive non-violent action, an opportunity to avoid a national disaster and create a new spirit of class and racial harmony. We can write another luminous moral chapter in American history. All of us are on trial in this troubled hour, but time still permits us to meet the future with a clear conscience.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and myself, I send to the desk a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 275) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate of the United States has heard with profound sorrow of the tragic death of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., a dedicated and courageous leader in the interests of the individual rights and the equality of man; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senate condemns this vicious and senseless act which ended his life and records its respect and appreciation for the immense service and sacrifice of this dedicated American, whose timeless memorial will be the tradition of non-violence in the struggle for social progress and human dignity; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senate extends to his wife and members of his family its deepest sympathy in their hour of personal grief; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the family of the deceased.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BARTLETT, from the Committee on Commerce, without amendment:

S. 3102. A bill to postpone for 2 years the date on which passenger vessels operating solely on the inland rivers and waterways must comply with certain safety standards (Rept. No. 1080);

H.R. 9473. An act to provide provisions of the Shipping Act, 1916, to authorize the Federal Maritime Commission to permit a common carrier by water in foreign commerce or conference of such carriers to refund a portion of the freight charges (Rept. No. 1078); and

H.R. 14401. An act to grant the masters of certain U.S. vessels a lien on those vessels for their wages (Rept. No. 1079).

By Mr. BARTLETT, from the Committee on Commerce, with amendments:

H.R. 12639. An act to remove certain limitations on ocean cruises (Rept. No. 1081).

By Mr. SPONG, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, without amendment:

H.R. 12019. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the B'nai B'rith Henry Monsky Foundation in the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 1082).

By Mr. SPONG, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments:

H.R. 15131. An act to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 to increase salaries, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1083).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 3287. A bill to provide for orderly trade in fresh fruits and vegetables, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance; and S. 3288. A bill for the relief of Dr. Saturnino E. Martinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. MONDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 10 a.m. Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WE MUST DO SOMETHING ABOUT THE DRAFT

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the administration of our Selective Service System under General Hershey is a repugnant mess. It could be considered a wart on the face of our civilization or a stone under the instep of progress in the United States. Apart from his maladministration of the system and General Hershey's attempts to use the draft to suppress freedom of speech, the law itself has many defects. We in Congress should review it very thoroughly, and before next June 30 enact into law a greatly improved Selective Service Act. It is bad enough to go about conscripting youngsters into our Armed Forces. It is absolutely and totally unfair, arbitrary, and capricious to continue the present system without adopting guidelines to achieve decency and fairness in operation of draft boards throughout the country.

Any law that compels some young men to sacrifice their freedom and even their lives in the Armed Forces of our country while others remain free to pursue normal lives is inherently unfair. Unfortunately, in this grim period of international anarchy and throughout our involvement in a miserable civil war in Vietnam, whether the fighting should end this year or continue into future years, it will continue to be necessary for our Nation to maintain an army composed in large part of draftees. However, there is no excuse for any selective service law that contains as many inequities as the one under which young Americans are now being called to military duty.

Reform of the draft is long overdue. Little by little we tinker with the system, but the fact is that it requires a complete overhaul. The system was, after all, designed for massive conscription to secure an army of some millions to fight in World War II. It functioned remarkably well. However, the draft has since been used either for maintaining a large peacetime army or for limited or fluctuating manpower needs and in doing so

it has created confusion and injustices.

Last year a national advisory commission examined the Selective Service System and proposed sweeping reforms to make the draft more responsive both to national needs and personal rights. Unfortunately, the Congress chose to ignore most of these recommendations, and instead enacted shortsighted patchwork legislation.

The operation of the present selective service law has been unfair and discriminatory in many respects. For example, too much discretion for granting deferments or exemptions has been in the hands of local selective service boards. There are no mandatory national criteria for deferments. This results in thousands of varying standards of deferment, with some boards granting exemptions while a neighboring draft board in the same State, and frequently in the same city, makes an opposite ruling in an identical case and lists a registrant as available to be called into service immediately. Since available pools of eligible draftees differ from one draft board jurisdiction to another, consideration given to the problems of individual potential draftees differs from one draft board to the next.

Also, deferments too frequently favor those who can afford to attend college and those whose educations qualify them to enter critical occupations, so-called. The fact is, that young men from families with financial resources are in a better position to secure deferment by going to college or by marrying young and having children.

The proposal introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] for instituting a random selection by lottery, the induction of the youngest first, administrative reorganization of the Selective Service System, mandatory national standards for classification, and elimination of occupational deferments except where the President may determine them justified in the national interest, should very definitely receive priority for consideration by the Congress this year.

Young men should be inducted at the age of 18 or 19 instead of the present system of starting at age 26 and working backward. In each of the next several years, nearly 2 million young men will reach the age of 19. In 1970 that number will probably exceed 2 million. Of this number, three of 10 will probably be disqualified for physical or mental reasons or deferred for reasons of hardship or general unfitness. Under the random system of selection each year the required number of inductees would be selected by a lottery method from the pool of qualified 19-year-olds. Those not selected would know that they did not face induction in the future except in event of a national emergency and then could plan years ahead much better.

This system would remove the uncertainty from the lives of young men who today are unable to plan their futures because of the many years in which they are subject to induction. Those selected by the lottery method but who wish to attend college would be permitted to postpone their military service until after

graduation in time of peace, but such deferments would be denied or suspended in time of war when casualties reach a given point to insure that all young men serve as equals in wartime.

It is certain that drafting for active duty in our Armed Forces of young men who have attained their 18th birthday or who are 19 years of age would have many advantages from every standpoint. First and foremost from a standpoint of national defense, youngsters 18 and 19 who have acquired a high school education make the best and most fearless fighting men. They are intelligent, readily trained, and respond in combat more vigorously, more fearlessly, and have greater capability than soldiers who are considerably older.

Furthermore, following their tours of duty and honorable discharges from our Armed Forces to the Active Reserve in civilian life they would no longer have the specter of being drafted hanging over them and possibly disrupting their family life. Comparatively few young men of 18 and 19 are married. There is no problem of dependents. If they are sent overseas for a tour of duty of 12 months or even 18 months in some foreign land our taxpayers do not bear the added burden they would have and do have when young men of 24, 25, and 26, many of them married and some with children, are drafted into our Armed Forces.

Intelligence is a requirement in modern warfare and national mandatory guidelines regarding deferment of illiterate and ignorant young men should be established, and those standards should be maintained everywhere. Without a doubt the local draft board that first exempted Cassius Clay because of his lack of intelligence took the correct action in rendering that decision. They were weak and wrong in giving in to public clamor. The net result was that lawyers who misrepresented Clay profited. Except for the fact that Cassius Clay could have rendered service were he enrolled in the USO for boxing exhibitions at our military bases overseas and in this country the same as Joe Louis in World War II, this uneducated and illiterate athlete would probably have been useless as a fighting man in combat.

Very definitely, I also advocate that the period of service under the Selective Service System should be for 18 months and not 2 years. It is noteworthy that of our allies, Great Britain and Canada have no draft laws, no conscription whatsoever. New Zealand provides conscription for a period of 12 months only. Belgium conscripts for 12 to 15 months only; Italy 15 months only. France conscripts her young men for 16 months; West Germany for 18 months; and the Netherlands provides conscription for a period of 18 months. In South Vietnam the Saigon military junta has not drafted young men of 18 and 19. There has been no general mobilization. Those older men who have been ordered into service have been able to buy exemption from the draft upon payment of from \$685 to \$800, dependent upon the greed of the provincial leaders.

In an effort to eliminate one of the present system's most blatant inequi-

ties regarding the drafting of graduate students, the administration has only created fresh injustices. It has raised grave difficulties for the Nation's colleges and universities and probably for the armed services as well. Some educators estimate that graduate classes may be cut in half next year in many institutions of higher learning. Government officials have set the figure closer to 30 percent, but if enrollment is cut even by a third, all universities will have to drastically curtail their graduate programs and in some cases eliminate them. It is quite likely that the Army will have a much larger proportion of college graduates than it actually has any use for.

Mr. President, were the lottery system in effect, young men would be able to plan for their futures including post-graduate work. It would provide a much more orderly method of conscription and at the same time permit the Nation to maintain a proper level of educational quality. While I believe that there is definitely a need for action to prevent graduate schools from becoming mere havens for those seeking to evade induction, a more reasonable process should have been developed for dividing the wheat from the chaff, the serious students from draft evaders.

Mr. President, I am hopeful that in time we shall end military conscription and establish a professional volunteer army. Certainly, more serious consideration should be given to studying the possibility of doing so as soon as possible.

Until then the Nation must require that young men serve in our Armed Forces, particularly at a time when our administration leaders in Washington adopt a policy that we have a mandate from Almighty God to police the entire world, and to prescribe for far away nations that they must not have a nationalist Communist government but they may have rule by a militarist regime or have a Fascist government. Nevertheless, in this land of equals, men must be selected to serve by an equitable system. No draft law will please everybody, but it is surely high time that we design a system designed to meet the realities of 1968 and not a world war that ended in 1945.

A JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE FOR STATE LEGISLATURES

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, from time to time I have expressed concern regarding the very great need for State governments, and especially the State legislatures, to modernize their operations and begin to face up to the burgeoning responsibilities of the States if our federal system is to be preserved.

It is always heartening to report encouraging developments in this field. The Citizens Conference on State Legislatures, under the leadership of former Postmaster General Edward Day; former Kansas Governor John Anderson; and the executive director, Larry Margolis, is beginning to make its efforts felt in various States over the country. The Council of State Governments is beginning to urge upon its constituents the necessity of intensive attention to

urban affairs. The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, in its recurring reports, points out various areas of needed improvement in Federal-State-local relations.

One of the principal areas of State inactivity has been in the field of long-range economic analysis and planning. In one of the first such steps taken anywhere, Jesse M. Unruh, the distinguished speaker of the California Assembly, with bipartisan assistance, has introduced legislation calling for the establishment in the legislature in that State of a joint economic committee. The bill states the following as its basic purpose:

The Legislature finds and declares that the maintenance of the policy of the State of California for full employment, maximum economic productivity and continued economic growth requires that the Legislature have available accurate and independent resources for the collection and analysis of economic information and forecasts. The Legislature further finds that provision of such economic studies and forecasts can best be achieved through the establishment of a joint legislative committee, adequately staffed with economists and other professional personnel, rather than through continued sole reliance upon the executive agencies of state government for such economic information and advice, and to that end this chapter is enacted.

I hope that the legislation in California is successful and I hope that other States take note of this additional major step down the road toward responsive and responsible government on the part of the legislature of our largest State.

It has been my pleasure to have been able to discuss State governmental problems with Speaker Unruh on many occasions. He is, as every practicing student of political science knows, a giant among legislative leaders and a principal architect and advocate of State legislative reform. This new proposal for a joint economic committee is typical of the vision and leadership Jesse Unruh has demonstrated in State governmental reform. I commend it to advocates of State legislative improvement throughout the Nation.

I ask that the text of assembly bill No. 265 and introductory remarks by Speaker Unruh be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF ASSEMBLY SPEAKER JESSE M. UNRUH CONCERNING ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 265, CREATING THE JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

For a number of years, during both Democratic and Republican administrations, I have been extremely concerned over the effects on the Legislature's decision-making capabilities of the way in which the Department of Finance operates and is used by the executive. For some time legislators of both parties have expressed concern over the failure of this important agency to formulate valid revenue and expenditure estimates. I am sure you recall my objections to this failure during Governor Brown's Administration. I have seen little improvement during the present Administration.

Let me give you a few examples of the difficulties which we in the Legislature have in dealing with, or trusting, the Department of Finance exclusively for fiscal data. In 1965 the Petris-Unruh tax reform bill was pend-

ing before the Assembly. On the morning of the day that bill was scheduled to be heard in the Ways and Means Committee, the then-Director of Finance—by sleight of hand, or other unknown means—came up with a sudden General Fund surplus of more than \$100 million which he claimed obviated the necessity for our tax reform measure. It was clear to most of us in the Legislature at that time that this new revenue "find" was designed to kill off the support which AB 2270 had generated among members of both parties.

Again, last fall, in a five-month period we saw a vaunted \$210 million deficit in our Medi-Cal program evaporate inexplicably and turn into a \$31 million surplus. I am sure we were all chagrined to find that we had spent the final two weeks of our four week special session talking about a program which, at that time, the Administration knew full well was fiscally sound.

Finally, several months ago the present Director of Finance called a news conference to announce that the Governor's Budget would show a \$194 million surplus; in the next breath he "warned" that this was only a "paper surplus", none of which could be spent. His explanation was so clear that after 45 minutes of it, when he asked the assembled newsmen if they had any questions, the room—according to one newspaper report I saw—"erupted in laughter".

I think I need not describe more of these instances. Whatever our partisan political affiliation, we are all familiar with them.

I believe that the fiscal affairs of California are too important to be left to political manipulation by the executive branch of government. Assemblyman Veneman's Revenue and Taxation Committee took the first step toward making revenue estimating non-partisan when it insisted on an amendment in last year's tax bill requiring the Controller to audit the cash-flow information presented in the executive budget. I believe this bill is the next logical step.

Assembly Bill 265 creates a new and influential joint committee of the Legislature, called the "Joint Economic Committee". It transfers to that body all duties, functions, and staff presently under control of the Joint Legislative Budget Committee. It adds, however, numerous other important duties which are not exercised by any legislative agency.

The bill constitutes the Joint Economic Committee with the leadership of both parties in both Houses of the Legislature. It is a ten-man committee, the Assembly contingent to be composed of the Speaker, the Minority Leader, the chairmen of the Ways and Means and the Revenue and Taxation committees, and one additional member appointed by the Speaker. Under the present organization of this House, this would lead to a politically balanced Assembly contingent. The Senate half of the committee would be composed of the President pro Tempore, the Minority Leader, the chairmen of the Finance and the Revenue and Taxation committees, and one appointment by the Senate Rules Committee.

This would be a powerful committee, capable of exerting considerable legislative influence over expenditure and revenue policies. I think everyone will concede that as effective as Alan Post's office now is—and I have always been one of the Legislative Analyst's strong defenders—the Joint Budget Committee has not been active as a committee recently.

We propose to transfer the Legislative Analyst's present duties of line-item, and program-by-program budget review to the Joint Economic Committee. I think we all agree that in this field Mr. Post and his staff have done an outstanding job. Further, the functions of that office of providing confidential fiscal information to Members of the Legislature on request, and of analyzing appropriation bills would remain unchanged.

However, this bill creates new duties within that office, duties which have never

been performed and which I believe are most important to the Legislature. A principal new duty is for the committee and its staff to analyze the annual economic report of the Governor, required by law to be rendered by him to the Legislature, and to hold hearings and make a report on it. This is identical to present legislation which created the Joint Economic Committee of the U.S. Congress in 1946. It has proven most successful at the federal level in allowing Congress to gain a broad overview of the economic outlook of the country. We need to do the same thing in California. Only by knowing what the economic indicators are—what are expenditure policies of governments at local and federal levels—can we intelligently make long-term, valid expenditure and taxation decisions in the Legislature. The Governor's annual economic report now gathers dust on our shelves; I doubt if many of us have ever looked at it. This new committee duty will provide legislative scrutiny of that important report.

Other duties of the new committee and its staff include:

1. Monitoring federal fiscal policies which may have an effect upon California's economy, and the Legislature's fiscal decisions;

2. The preparation of economic forecasts, and a comparison of these independently prepared data with similar data developed by the Governor's Department of Finance;

3. Inclusion in the annual budget analysis of an evaluation by the committee staff of the accuracy of Department of Finance revenue and expenditure estimates;

4. Other vital duties of long-range expenditure projections, the development of priorities among state programs competing for funds, continuing studies of performance and program budgeting, to include cost-effectiveness studies of state programs and agencies, and a number of other specialized studies.

Let me make it very clear that in offering this legislation I do not want in any way to be interpreted as being critical of the present Legislative Analyst or his staff. I believe Mr. Post has done an excellent job. But I believe that as a responsible legislative body—and an independent one—we must do more.

Mr. Post has worked with my staff in developing AB 265 and his assistance has been invaluable. We have also consulted with other Assembly committee staff, with noted economists at our universities and out-of-state, and with the staff of the Joint Economic Committee of Congress. We have their overwhelming approval of the concept of this bill.

This is not a Democratic or a Republican bill, as the coauthors on AB 265 demonstrate. Rather, it is a measure which seeks to maintain and strengthen the independence of the Legislature to make informed policy decisions in the fiscal area. With a state budget of five and one-half billion dollars a year, we simply cannot afford—the taxpayers cannot afford—to limp along on partial information any longer. I believe this legislation will go a long way toward a responsible solution of this problem.

ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 265

An act to amend Section 15901 of, to add Chapter 6 (commencing with Section 10650) to Part 2, Division 2, Title 2 of, and to repeal Article 7 (commencing with Section 9140), Chapter 1, Part 1, Division 2, Title 2 of the Government Code, relating to aides to the Legislature

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. Article 7 (commencing with Section 9140), Chapter 1, Part 1, Division 2, Title 2 of the Government Code is repealed.

SEC. 2. Chapter 6 (commencing with Section 10650) is added to Part 2, Division 2, Title 2 of the Government Code, to read:

"CHAPTER 6. JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE"

"10650. The Legislature finds and declares that the maintenance of the policy of the State of California for full employment, maximum economic productivity and continued economic growth requires that the Legislature have available accurate and independent resources for the collection and analysis of economic information and forecasts. The Legislature further finds that provision of such economic studies and forecasts can best be achieved through the establishment of a joint legislative committee, adequately staffed with economists and other professional personnel, rather than through continued sole reliance upon the executive agencies of state government for such economic information and advice, and to that end this chapter is enacted.

"10651. There is hereby created a permanent joint committee of the Legislature, to be known as the Joint Economic Committee. The committee shall be composed of ten members, five of whom shall be Members of the Assembly and five of whom shall be Members of the Senate. The Assembly members shall consist of the following: the Speaker of the Assembly, the Chairman of the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means, the Chairman of the Assembly Committee on Revenue and Taxation, the Minority Leader of the Assembly, and one Member of the Assembly appointed by the Speaker. The Senate members shall consist of the following: the President pro Tempore of the Senate, the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance, the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Revenue and Taxation, the Minority Leader of the Senate, and one Member of the Senate appointed by the Senate Committee on Rules. The chairman of the committee shall be elected biennially from among the membership of the committee by a majority vote of each house's delegation on the committee.

"10652. The Joint Economic Committee shall, on the effective date of this chapter succeed to all powers, duties, and functions of the Joint Legislative Budget Committee.

"10653. The Joint Economic Committee shall by a majority vote of its members from each house, appoint an executive director and fix his compensation. The executive director shall, on the effective date of this chapter, succeed to all powers, duties, and functions of the Legislative Analyst.

"10654. The executive director shall, subject to approval by the committee, appoint technical and clerical staff necessary to assist him in the performance of his duties. At least two members of the staff thus appointed shall be professional economists, experienced in economic forecasting.

"10655. The Joint Economic Committee shall have the following general duties and responsibilities:

"(a) The committee shall analyze the annual economic report of the Governor, employing public hearings and staff analysis, and shall submit a report on the economic report as provided in Section 15901. The committee shall include in its report any recommendations for legislative action at both the state and federal levels which it may deem necessary for the continued economic health of the state.

"(b) The committee shall monitor federal legislation and federal executive decisions which may have an effect upon the state's economy, and its growth and development. The committee may arrange for representation by the California Legislature before federal agencies and the Congress, where it deems appropriate.

"(c) The committee shall prepare economic forecasts and related data, and shall compare such data with similar information prepared by executive agencies of state government and contained in the Governor's Budget and economic report. The committee's annual analysis of the Governor's Budget shall contain an evaluation by the

executive director and his staff of the accuracy and adequacy of the revenue estimates and forecasts of state economic activity and other pertinent information contained in the Governor's Budget.

"(d) The committee shall ascertain facts and make recommendations to the Legislature and to the houses thereof concerning the state budget, the revenues and expenditures of the state, the organization and functions of the state, its departments, subdivisions, and such other matters as may be provided for in the Joint Rules of the Senate and Assembly.

"(e) The committee shall study and periodically report on the subjects of long-range expenditure and revenue planning and policies.

"(f) The committee shall present appropriate economic and budgetary data on the various state programs, such that the Legislature may develop priorities among programs competing for state funds.

"(g) The committee shall conduct continuing studies of program and performance budgeting systems, and shall undertake periodically to evaluate the cost-effectiveness of state programs and agencies.

"(h) The committee may undertake other special studies, including but not limited to:

"(1) Studies of state debt management
"(2) Studies of state-federal-local fiscal relations

"(3) Studies of state economic growth, where it can be influenced by the decisions of state government

"(4) Studies of the efficiency of state government operations within the several agencies.

"(i) The committee shall, in its deliberations and investigations, give particular attention to the impact of scientific and technological advances upon the conduct of state programs and upon the state's economy.

"10656. The Joint Economic Committee shall have the power to appoint subcommittees from among its membership to be composed equally of members from each house of the Legislature; to conduct hearings within the state on problems within its jurisdiction; to issue subpoenas where necessary to compel the attendance of witnesses; and to compel the cooperation of state executive agencies in conducting its business.

"10657. The committee has a continuing existence and may meet, act, and conduct its business at any place within this state, during sessions of the Legislature or any recess thereof, and in the interim period between sessions.

"10658. The provisions of the Joint Rules of the Senate and Assembly relating to investigating committees shall apply to the committee and it shall have such powers, duties, and responsibilities as the Joint Rules of the Senate and Assembly shall from time to time prescribe, and all the powers conferred on committees under Section 11, Article IV, of the Constitution."

SEC. 3. Section 15901 of the Government Code is amended to read:

15901. (a) The Governor, utilizing his staff and the resources of state agencies responsible to him in preparation thereof, shall transmit to the Legislature not later than the 30th calendar day of each regular session an economic report setting forth:

(1) The rates and levels of employment, production, income and purchasing power obtaining in the state and needed to carry out the policy of full employment;

(2) Current and foreseeable trends in the levels of employment, production, income, and purchasing power;

(3) A review of the economic program of the state and its political subdivisions, as affected by economic decisions and policies of the federal government, and a review of economic conditions affecting employment in the state or any considerable portion thereof during the preceding year and of

their effect upon employment, production, income, and purchasing power;

(4) A program for carrying out the policy of full employment, together with such recommendations for legislation as he may deem necessary or desirable;

(5) A statement of economic forecasting data designed to indicate future state revenue needs, assuming existing expenditure levels of state government, and a similar statement, assuming any proposed increases in expenditures recommended by him;

(b) The Governor may transmit from time to time to the Legislature reports supplementary to the economic report, each of which shall include supplementary or revised recommendations as he may deem necessary or desirable to achieve the policy of full employment.

(c) Upon receipt of the annual economic report of the Governor, the Joint Economic Committee shall conduct public hearings on the substance of the report, and no later than 15 days after receipt of the Governor's report the Joint Economic Committee shall issue a report on the economic report of the Governor. Such report shall include recommendations concerning the accuracy of the economic information contained in the Governor's report, together with any recommendations concerning the Governor's report which the committee may wish to make.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1056, S. 3262. I do this so that the bill will become the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3262) to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

SUPPORT FOR SENATE RATIFICATION OF THE HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS IS VERY IMPRESSIVE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the support for ratification of the human rights conventions is indeed plentiful. The basic principles behind our Declaration of Independence and Constitution are the same as those which inspired men of our time to draft the human rights treaties. Our entire American legal tradition seeks to protect the rights of the individual and to shield him from the arbitrary action of government. That is precisely the objective of these treaties.

These human rights treaties are backed by such respected American organizations as: The National Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice, the National Conference of Christians and Jews, the National Board of the YWCA, the NAACP, the American Baptist Convention, the American Jewish Congress, the American Jewish Committee, and the United Church of Christ.

Such distinguished Americans as John Kennedy, Lyndon Johnson, Dean Rusk, Arthur Goldberg, and Willard Wirtz

have given their strong support to the ratification of these treaties.

I urge the Members of the Senate to add their "aye" to the American chorus of support for these treaties and ratify the Conventions on Genocide, Forced Labor, Freedom of Association, and Political Rights of Women.

THE AMERICAN AIM IN VIETNAM

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, the American aim in Vietnam, as we approach, apparently, the first tentative talks with North Vietnam regarding terms for an eventual solution to the war in Indochina, remain unchanged. The war will end, and Americans will leave when North Vietnam and its Vietcong allies stop invading, stop infiltrating, and stop trying to subvert by force of arms the government of the south.

If the war can be ended on these terms, then the American sacrifices will have been worthwhile.

Today Columnist Joseph Alsop, in what is an open letter to our chief negotiator, W. Averell Harriman, sets forth the situation very clearly as we enter this new phase, resulting from President Johnson's statesmanlike removal of the war from political considerations. His act has freed his hands and, as Mr. Alsop points out, it has freed the hands of our negotiators. But it has not changed our purpose. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Alsop's column be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOTE TO "CROCODILE" HARRIMAN: "TELL HANOI TAKE IT OR LEAVE IT"

(By Joseph Alsop)

HUE-PHUBAI, SOUTH VIETNAM.—In the wholly new circumstances created by President Johnson's memorable and superb act of self-abnegation, a short memorandum for his chief peace negotiator, W. Averell Harriman, may perhaps be in order. It follows:

"DEAR GOVERNOR: In the first month of the golden Kennedy years, I had to tell one of the impatient new young men, who did not remember the heroic past, that you were a bit like an old crocodile. I explained that you were quiescent-looking, even somnolent-seeming until the dictates of common sense or the great interests of the United States were attacked—whereupon the great jaws opened, and another fool found that he was figuratively missing a leg.

"MacBundy liked and popularized the nickname, and I am afraid it stuck. And if Hanoi responds to the President's invitation to send someone to talk peace with you, the remarkable qualities of 'The Old Crocodile' will be more than ever needed.

"It should not be necessary to remind you of what you once said President Kennedy told you concerning Laos—that any kind of patch-up there would do for the time being, since Vietnam was the main theater, and the future of Laos and of all of Asia would be settled by the outcome of the struggle in Vietnam. That outcome cannot be another patch-up, however, unless you wish the sacrifices of hundreds of thousands of young Americans to turn to dust and ashes in your hands. There is no question, either, of 'winning' or 'losing' in Vietnam. We have never sought anything definable as 'victory' over the North Vietnamese. We have not desired their subjugation, nor sought to change their ruthless and dogmatic government, nor planned to invade their territory.

"We have merely sought to halt their inva-

sion of their neighbor to the South, as they wholly falsely promised to halt their invasion of Laos in the agreement that they signed with you.

"In this respect, the magnificent patriotism and disinterestedness the President has displayed give you wonderful freedom of maneuver. You do not need to worry about your chief's electoral prospects (and I had just heard from home that you had decided to stick with him despite your attachment to Sen. Kennedy).

"You do not need to accept false negotiating currency, because it can be made to look like the real thing at the convention or for a while thereafter. You do not need to heed the councils of the defeat-at-any-price crowd, who will urge you to believe in promises that will never be kept. Above all, you do not need to tolerate the endlessly reiterated North Vietnamese program of fighting while negotiating.

"If we accept fighting while negotiating, it will be ten times, a hundred times worse than it was in Korea, and there we suffered more than 90,000 casualties after the talks began. But there, at least, we did not lose the war, whereas here, acceptance of anything of that sort will lead to sure defeat, because of this war's infinitely more complex and inter-penetrating pattern, which lends itself so perfectly to Communist treachery.

"The issue here is crystal clear. If the North Vietnamese go home, bag and baggage, and if they cease to support domestic subversion in South Vietnam our sacrifices will turn out to be worthwhile. They can take home with them those of the VC who have stained their hands with murder—and they are many—and any others who may wish to go. The people of South Vietnam will then be quite capable of settling their own affairs, and since they are a brave and intelligent people, with an immensely rich country, they should have a wonderfully prosperous future.

"In weighing this issue, there are two things to bear in mind: First, sickness in our country in which it is thought wonderfully laughable to deny that American forces in the field have suffered heavy defeat. In certain circles, in Washington and New York particularly, the notion of American success is thought downright ludicrous. One may be certain that this singular view is not shared by average Americans.

"Please bear in mind that if Hanoi had believed its men could win the prior war of attrition, then the war of attrition would have continued. And if any American general tried anything like the Tet offensive investing comparable resources, suffering comparable losses and failing to attain all his stated objectives—he would not just be relieved. He would be lynched.

"Second, please bear in mind that almost all Washington discussion of the northern bombing is both illogical and ill-informed. The plain facts are that Hanoi's greatest deficiency is manpower, and the bombing has been tying up something like 800,000 men in the tasks of air defense, transport and general repair. The great danger is that Hanoi will take advantage of a bombing pause to pour much of this huge and last-remaining manpower pool into the southern war.

"Before the President acted, the war was already at its climax. His self-abnegation has untied your hands, and above all, it has untied his hands. Speaking for him, therefore, you can say, 'Take it or leave it' with high confidence. And if they do not take it, we can go in to win. Good luck from an old friend."

SUPPORT OF S. 3218, EXPORT-IMPORT BANK LIBERALIZATION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I am strongly in favor of S. 3218. Most of the members of the Committee on Banking

and Currency will recall that in January 1965, I introduced S. 558, the proposed Export Expansion Act. Title II of that bill proposed to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 to enlarge the statement of purpose in the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 and to create a special fund for the financing of exports "where such financing is not otherwise available and where such exports are in the national interest." The pending S. 3218 is very similar in purpose and in general substance to my bill of 3 years ago, and I think that the arguments advanced then in favor of such a financing facility apply even more emphatically today.

Hearings were held on S. 558 on March 17, 18, and 19, 1965. The testimony of numerous witnesses from the business and banking communities was overwhelmingly in favor of this proposal. The interested agencies of the executive branch provided written comments which, although recognizing the pressures of fast-growing foreign trade competition on U.S. exporters and the need for maximum flexibility in our own export financing facilities, indicated some reservations about enactment of the bill at that time. Administration officials generally stated that, in view of the Bank's intention to liberalize its existing facilities and practices and also in view of improved consultative arrangements between the interested agencies, it did not appear to be necessary to make the changes proposed in title II of the bill at that time.

In February 1966, the proposal for the national interest fund, as contemplated by S. 558, received strong endorsement from both the National Export Expansion Council and the NEEC Action Committee on Export Financing. As the committee knows, the NEEC is a blue ribbon group of American businessmen and bankers established by the Department of Commerce to provide advice on behalf of the American business community with respect to export expansion programs. The report of the NEEC Action Committee recommended creation within Eximbank through appropriate legislation of a special fund of at least \$500 million for export credit guarantees to U.S. exporters and their commercial bankers to facilitate the financing of U.S. goods and services "under unusual situations." The recommendation stated that this special fund would be "as contemplated by the proposed Magnuson-Adams Export Expansion Act of 1965" and "would parallel the 'national interest' funds operated by the British and Canadian governments." Circumstances and categories of transactions where the special fund might be employed are listed: First, sales to countries phasing out of AID concessional terms; second, meeting foreign competition; and third, market penetration. The NEEC itself has held two subsequent discussions on the recommendations of the action committee—in March 1967 and February of this year—and it strongly reaffirmed its support of these recommendations. At the NEEC meeting of February 2, 1968, the plans of the executive branch, as outlined in President Johnson's January 1 balance-of-payments message, were

presented briefly to the NEEC which indicated its full support for the administration's proposal.

The urgency and emphasis now placed by the administration on export expansion exports are the largest single component of our balance of payments; the experience and evidence compiled in recent years as to the keenness of competition in the international trade field, including competition as to credit terms; and the advice of eminent businessmen and Government officials, all make it clear to me, and I hope to Senators, that the proposal for a national interest fund, advanced in our bill of 1965, rested upon a solid justification which has been more than fully substantiated by subsequent events.

I believe there is little doubt that the Eximbank has operated with effectiveness within its legislative charter. However, more flexibility is clearly needed to win more export sales for the United States. In my judgment, S. 3218, as drafted, is quite adequate to provide this type of flexibility and additional competitiveness to the U.S. export financing system. I therefore urge your favorable action on this bill.

I would like to add one final word of advice as to the administration of the proposed special account. The new account must result in genuinely additional exports for the United States. We must recognize the possibility that certain transactions presented to the Eximbank might simply be shifted to the new account which, in the absence of this new facility, Eximbank might have financed in any case from its regular resources. Such shifting and substitution must be avoided, if the special account is to fulfill its purpose of truly additional exports. The Export Expansion Advisory Committee, under the chairmanship of the Secretary of Commerce, should therefore be alert to this possibility in considering applications for financing from the special account. Turndowns of applications by Eximbank prior to Bank Board review should also be referred to the Advisory Committee with a specific explanation of the reasons for the turndown. In appropriate instances, the Advisory Committee might return a transaction to the Eximbank for further consideration under its regular account. A procedure along these lines would, I believe, go far in assuring that the use of the new account would result in genuinely additional exports for the United States which will be to our balance-of-payments and commercial benefit.

In summary, I feel today, as I did 3 years ago, that this type of financing for American exports is an important means of improving our balance of payments, and I urge favorable consideration of S. 3218 by the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency.

DEPRIVATION AND PERSONALITY: A NEW CHALLENGE TO HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Government Research, of which I am chairman, will hold hearings on "Deprivation and Personality: A New Challenge to Human Resources Develop-

ment." More than 20 experts in social work, educators, and Government officials will testify during the 6 days of hearings to begin next Monday, April 8.

The subcommittee will solicit from the witnesses, who represent a diversity of knowledge and experience, their insights on the nature of the psychological and sociological aspects of human resources development. We are particularly interested in these questions as they relate to the hard core unemployed. It is increasingly apparent that we need to offer more than just job skills to the unemployed and underemployed. Many individuals and families, deprived of opportunity, have lost hope and faith in themselves.

The President's Commission on Civil Disorders, on which I was proud to serve, released its report in March, accurately portraying the divisions and deep wounds which exist in our society. The Commission made many concrete recommendations for action to heal these wounds.

It also gave special emphasis to motivating the hard core unemployed. The report said:

A sure method for motivating the hard core unemployed has not yet been devised. One fact, however, is already clear from the experience of the Job Corps, Neighborhood Youth Corps, and Manpower Development and Training projects: the previously hard-core unemployed trainee or employee must believe that he is not being trained for or offered a "dead end" job.

Our hearings will try to clarify some of the complexities surrounding this problem by pursuing a three-pronged inquiry. First, what approaches or strategies are being or can be employed to help motivate people to improve their socioeconomic status? Second, what programs have been and can be designed to implement these approaches? Third, what research projects—such as motivational, crosscultural, and longitudinal studies—are being or can be conducted to deepen our insights and expand our knowledge of the impact of deprivation and disadvantage on personality?

Many other questions emanate from the three dimensions of our hearings and will be explored. We do not necessarily expect to come up with definitive answers, but rather to focus attention on the problems, on the efforts now being made and innovative approaches needed. We hope the printed hearings will assemble in one place for the first time a useful handbook on the philosophy and methodology which can most effectively help people of deprived or disadvantaged background gain the motivation and self-confidence necessary for taking advantage of opportunity.

EQUAL TIME

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, the political consequences of President Johnson's announcement that he would not seek another term are enormous. One of the most obvious is the effect his statement will have upon the growing clamor for national television debates between the leading contenders for the Presidency.

Nearly a year ago, I introduced a bill in the Senate (S. 1859) which would re-

peal the equal time doctrine with regard to candidates for President and Vice President. The principal argument brought forth against its passage at that time was the fact that it would put enormous pressure on an incumbent President to publicly debate the wisdom of his policies with his chief opponent. Many felt then and still believe today that such a confrontation might lead to an outburst by the incumbent in the heat of debate that could jeopardize our national interests and perhaps even our national security.

Mr. President, I have never found that argument very persuasive. The tempo of a presidential campaign sorely tries the mettle of every man who competes and the ultimate victor is usually a man exceedingly well qualified to discuss the issues of the day without losing his self-control. In any event, Sunday's announcement has removed this roadblock. All the positive arguments for passage of S. 1859 still remain.

For example, the cost of political campaigns has soared in recent years, with a large part of the increase attributable to a growing reliance on television as the most effective method of mass communication. In 1966, candidates of all parties spent a total of \$32 million for spot announcements and political programs. This represents a 60-percent increase over the total spent in 1962, the last preceding non-presidential year, and almost equals the \$34.6 million spent in 1964 for presidential and non-presidential campaigns combined. Of this latter total, \$12.8 million, or approximately 37 percent was spent by presidential and vice-presidential candidates alone.

Mr. President, many prominent officials in the broadcasting industry have indicated that they would be willing to make free debating time available to candidates, particularly during presidential campaigns, but are currently deterred from doing so by section 315 of the Federal Communications Act of 1934 which requires them to give an equal amount of free time to all legally qualified candidates.

The problem facing public-spirited broadcasters is not a hypothetical one. In 1964, for example, there were roughly eight presidential candidates on the ballot in at least one State. If free time had then been given to the two major contenders, the broadcasters would have been forced to give an equal amount of time to all the other candidates in the field, whether or not they were serious. As a result overall campaign costs were greater and the public was denied the benefit of a face-to-face confrontation.

Mr. President, as we all remember, in 1960 the equal time provision of the law was suspended and resulted in the famous Kennedy-Nixon debates. It has estimated that approximately 115 million people saw or heard those 4 hour-long encounters, which, had the candidates been required to purchase that broadcast time, would have raised campaign expenses by roughly 2 million. If similar debates were to be staged today at commercial rates, the cost would be even greater.

CXIV—577—Part 7

But monetary savings alone are not sufficient reason to repeal the equal time provision, though certainly if we are to meet our responsibility to encourage all men of ability and not merely men of means to participate in public affairs more must be done to reduce the enormous costs involved. The primary purpose for repealing the equal time requirement is to encourage a thorough discussion of the issues by the two leading contenders for the highest office in the land. The American people deserve the opportunity to not only hear these men express their views, but also to study them as individuals grappling with weighty problems under pressure, for after all, this is what the victor will be doing daily once he assumes office. Such meetings can restore a healthy and necessary element in the style and public value of presidential campaigns.

Thus, there are a number of reasons why the equal time provision should be permanently repealed. And, because of present conditions, this is a particularly appropriate time to act. If we continue to delay, we will once again be faced with a presidential election involving an incumbent, and it is highly unlikely that the party in power, be it Republican or Democratic, will encourage the passage of legislation designed to reduce their political advantage by exposing the officeholder to a grueling face-to-face confrontation with his principal rival—despite the fact that such an encounter is in the interest of an enlightened citizenry.

Mr. President, last year this body unanimously passed the Election Reform Act of 1967. This was indeed a significant step toward improving the character and quality of the American democratic process. But we can and should do more.

Current law stifles, not stimulates, public debate. It encourages a growth, not a reduction in campaign spending. It must be reformed. Let us act, therefore, to repeal, not merely suspend, the equal time provision—at least with regard to presidential and vice presidential candidates—and boldly put public before party interests.

LOSS PAYMENTS ON DROUGHT DAMAGE

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, nearly half of our Oklahoma farmers who carry Federal crop insurance have received loss payments on drought damage to their 1967 crops. Some 2,750 of the 5,500 insured crops were damaged enough to qualify for loss payments totaling nearly \$3 million, making it the second highest total of loss payments to be paid in Oklahoma in the last 20 years.

I call this to your attention because I think it illustrates aptly how well this program of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, U.S. Department of Agriculture, is functioning and because I know that in Oklahoma, in many cases, the payments these farmers are receiving are the deciding factor in making it possible for them to continue farming instead of perhaps being forced out of business, deeply in debt.

It happens that in Oklahoma, farmers insured with Federal crop insurance have received about \$1.21 in loss payments over the 20-year period for every \$1 of premium they have paid in. That is bound to be true in some States, just as some years are "loss years" for FCIC and some are not. The important thing is that for the 39 States in which one-third of a million farmers now carry \$750 million in FCIC protection, the 20-year loss payout has averaged nationally about 95 cents for every premium dollar the farmers paid—which is how Congress asked that the program be operated when it was first established.

In good years, insured farmers have not only the peace of mind which comes with knowing they can be in business the following year, come what may, but they also have valuable additional bank credit which they are using more and more for expansion or operating loans. In disaster years, of course, the loss payments they receive are more times than not a godsend and a lifesaver.

In Oklahoma, Federal crop insurance is offered in 38 counties on one or more of five separate crops. All 38 have wheat protection available; eight of the 38 offer cotton insurance; 18 offer grain sorghum insurance; two offer peanut insurance, and two offer soybean protection. Two of the 38 counties offer protection on four of these five crops, six counties on three crops, 12 counties on two of the crops, and in 18 counties only wheat protection is available.

More than \$2,750,000 of the \$3 million in loss payments paid for the 1967 crop year was paid to 2,445 wheat farmers—331 other losses which were paid on the other four crops total \$115,000.

In 7 of the last 20 years, FCIC's loss payout in Oklahoma has exceeded the premiums farmers paid for those years.

It is gratifying to see such a voluntary program, paying its losses out of premium income, be so well accepted that it has more than doubled in scope nationally in the last 6 years. I think Congress can be proud it established Federal crop insurance to fill a long-felt need. And I know that the Department of Agriculture is pleased at how well it has been operating in recent years—filling a need which keeps increasing as farming becomes more expensive, and as the financial risks in farming grow.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY AT 10 A.M.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there being no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock a.m. on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, April 8, 1968, at 10 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The American Dental Association Pays Tribute to Senator Lister Hill

HON. GAYLORD NELSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 5, 1968

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] has compiled an unparalleled record of public service, both as a Representative and as a Senator.

Since his arrival in Washington in 1923 as a freshman Representative in the 68th Congress, LISTER HILL has made giant strides in improving the lives of all Americans.

For the past 45 years he has dedicated himself to promoting the welfare of our Nation. Few men in our long history have so willingly given of themselves as has Senator HILL.

In the House, he fought for Government operation of Muscle Shoals and helped finally to make this the core of the great Tennessee Valley Authority development. In the Senate, he was the principal advocate of an ever-widening program of Government medical research. He was the coauthor of the law that provides Federal funds for construction of hospitals. His record of accomplishments goes on and on, and will be indelibly printed in the annals of American history.

In the April issue of the Journal of the American Dental Association, a fine tribute is paid to Senator HILL. I ask unanimous consent that this impressive article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HON. LISTER HILL: LEADING STATESMAN FOR HEALTH AFFAIRS

(NOTE.—The American Dental Association pays tribute to its distinguished Honorary Member—the gentleman from Alabama—who during his 45 years in the U.S. Congress established an unprecedented record in the furthering of the Nation's health.)

"We stand today at the threshold of a Golden Age of Medicine." The words are those of Lister Hill. They are appropriate words for him to speak since he is eminently one of the men who has led us to that threshold. No man has done more than he to shape the health future of America, to give it promise and hope. He has done it with unfaltering vision, courtly eloquence, tireless leadership. Writing of him, William S. White, the noted newsman, said: "Countless millions owe their lives to Lister Hill. He has done more for the public health than any American in history."

Born in Montgomery, Alabama on December 29, 1894, Lister Hill's identification with the nation's health was a family heritage. His father, the late Dr. L. L. Hill, was one of the South's foremost physicians.

On August 14, 1923, Lister Hill was first elected to national office, taking a seat in the House of Representatives in the 68th Congress. It was the era of normalcy; Calvin Coolidge was President of the United States, and it would be eight years before the title, "The National Institute of Health," would come into being.

In 1938, Representative Hill became Senator Hill. His steady, lifelong concern for the health of the nation intensified during the early years in the Senate even as he carried out a full range of Senatorial duties, including the post of majority whip during the 77th, 78th, and 79th Congresses.

The list of health measures that Lister Hill has guided through the legislative process is of astounding length. His contributions have ranged across the entire spectrum of effort in the health field, encompassing facilities and services, research, education and training, and preventive services.

Of all the measures for which he is responsible, the one with perhaps the broadest impact is the Hill-Burton Act, which has helped provide 353,000 beds in hospitals and nursing homes and 2,400 other health facilities.

Other vital contributions have been in research. Senator Hill's efforts in this area began as early as 1928 when, in the House, he led the struggle for the Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, designed to conduct and encourage research in preventing and treating tropical disease.

It was Lister Hill who sponsored the measure, in 1948, to establish the National Institutes of Health as the research arm of the United States Public Health Service. Additional legislation through the years has made it possible for that agency to grow in specialized areas to keep pace with the fruits of research. Senator Hill's unfaltering interest has focused not only on the total program of the Institutes but on each of the specialized areas. It was at the recommendation of his Appropriations Subcommittee, for example, that Congress provided funds for an independently housed National Institute of Dental Research.

The Research Facilities Construction Act of 1956 is another major achievement sponsored by Senator Hill as is the establishment of the modern National Library of Medicine.

Such achievements go toward providing the tools that a highly trained professional team must have. A need that is perhaps even more basic is to assure a continuing supply of such professional workers. Here too Lister Hill has led, with credit for the Omnibus Health Act of 1956, The Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963, The Nurse Training Act of 1964 and the Allied Health Professions Personnel Training Act of 1966.

In the area of public health, the impetus to construction of public health centers under the Hill-Burton program has been a major factor in modernizing public health and health education. As of June 1, 1966, more than 1,240 health centers and laboratories had been or were being built under the auspices of the Hill-Burton program. Senator Hill is also an architect of the Comprehensive Health Planning and Public Health Service Amendments of 1966.

At the same time as these general efforts have been made, Lister Hill has pursued a compassionate interest in the handicapped, the mentally ill and the mentally retarded. The Hill-Harris Act of 1963, authorizing financial assistance for the construction of a comprehensive network of facilities for the mentally retarded and mentally ill, is precedent-setting legislation. He is the author as well, of the most comprehensive rehabilitation legislation Congress has enacted. The Hill-Burton provision for construction of rehabilitation facilities has provided a focal point for community efforts in rehabilitation.

Senator Hill has led in enactment of legislation relating to training of teachers of the deaf and providing braille textbooks and

other educational material for blind schoolchildren. It was his efforts that led to establishment of the National Technical Institute for the Deaf.

It has been frequently noted that Lister Hill is in a strategic position to further America's health programs since he is Chairman of the Committee of Labor and Public Welfare and Chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee concerned with health expenditures. Though there is some pragmatic truth in that, it is a little like saying that the sun begins to shine when the earth is warm. If America enjoys today the exultation of standing "at the threshold of a Golden Age of Medicine," it is not so much because those Chairmanships were held by Lister Hill as it is that those Chairmanships, at this crucial point in our history, were invested with purpose and meaning by a man who understood clearly that this nation's potential is equal to its needs, the Honorable Lister Hill of Alabama.

The American Teacher in Politics

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 5, 1968

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, beginning today the National Education Association and its constituent State associations will observe what has been designated as Teachers-in-Politics Weekend. I join my colleagues in saluting the teachers of America in their continuing efforts to play a role of ever-increasing importance in the affairs of the community, the State, and the Nation.

It was but a few years ago in Hawaii, as it still is in many of the States of the Union today, that teachers could not engage in partisan politics. A restrictive statute, dubbed the "little Hatch Act," effectively kept Hawaiian teachers and other territorial and county government employees away from politics. As a Member of the House of Representatives, Territory of Hawaii, I was one of the proponents who were successful in repealing our "little Hatch Act" and bringing political freedom to the teachers in Hawaii. Repeal of this law has made it possible for our teachers to engage in political activity after school hours and to enjoy all the rights and privileges of citizenship.

I strongly urge other States which have laws denying political freedom to their teachers to follow Hawaii's example.

Too often, the word "politics" has a negative connotation. As John F. Kennedy once said:

It is disheartening for me, and I think alarming for our republic to realize how poorly the political profession is regarded in America. Mothers may still want their favorite sons to grow up to be President, but according to a famous Gallup Poll some years ago, they did not want them to become politicians in the process.

I see the role of the teacher in politics as a positive and constructive one.

There are several spheres of political activity in which the teacher can participate effectively. Active membership in a professional organization such as the National Education Association which is sponsoring Teachers-In-Politics Weekend this coming April 5 through 7, can enlarge the base of the individual's political influence. Teacher organizations not only work to improve the status of the profession and the quality of the system as a whole, but they also seek to provide the individual teacher with information on the newest methods and materials and to give her the support of colleagues throughout the country. A good example of the activities of such organizations are the teacher clinics which are being sponsored by the Hawaii State classroom teachers this weekend. These clinics will examine and discuss the role of the teacher as a good citizen.

Individual participation in community and national affairs is another area in which the teacher can be effective. Nine out of 10 teachers voted in the national election in 1964, as compared to seven out of 10 people in the general voting population. It was estimated that by 1967, almost 50,000 teachers had been candidates for public office. These figures show a national trend among educators toward a more active involvement in politics which I hope will continue to grow, and which I know the Teachers-In-Politics Weekend will provide significant impetus.

Teachers in Politics

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 5, 1968

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, today, the National Education Association and its constituent State associations have launched a most worthwhile program called Teachers in Politics.

I think the purpose of this program can be summed up best by the following resolution concerning teacher activity during 1968.

This should be a year in which teachers make a new pledge to democracy, in which teachers assume cheerfully the duties that are a part of citizenship and in which city, state and nation will benefit from teachers leading free men to govern themselves with courage and vision.

Mr. President, in my home State of Kansas, the Kansas State Teachers Association is sponsoring six required political clinics tomorrow throughout the State to encourage teacher participation in political affairs and to motivate teachers to interest their students in politics.

In essence, this program allows our teachers to do their homework before exercising their rights as American citizens. These clinics are not concerned with partisan politics but with the creation of a more responsible citizenry and a better government.

I wish to go on record as commending the National Education Association and

the Kansas State teachers organization for this worthwhile and needed program.

Teachers in Politics—Positive Action for Democracy

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 5, 1968

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, since the first schools were established in New England during the 1600's, the American schoolteacher has been responsible for the guidance and development of the youth of our Nation. Through the patience and understanding of many millions of dedicated men and women, generations of children have learned the skills and values so essential to the continued vitality of our country. A wise man once noted that:

The most potent of all indirect influences in the development of our citizenry is the influence of a good teacher.

Today's teacher faces a greater challenge than any of his predecessors, for the choices which confront us in contemporary life are some of the most difficult ever thrust upon a democracy. Our response to these choices may well decide the future course of our own, and the world's history. Thus, the necessity of a responsible, well-informed citizenry is a crucial one, and one which is being met by the day-to-day efforts of teachers in classrooms in every part of the country.

The scope of the need is so great, however, that in many cases outside help has been necessary to enable schools and teachers to meet it effectively. Congress has recognized this crucial need and has provided Federal funds to assist in this undertaking. Believing that people are our most precious national asset, we have chosen to direct our money and our energies toward a productive investment in the best education possible for the youth of our Nation.

The success of our endeavor will determine our future greatness and, in large measure, it will depend on our teachers. How well they impart the values and ideals of a democracy to impressionable children will be the deciding factor in whether our legacy will be a viable political instrument, responsive to the needs and desires of a people or a system of hardened and unmanageable rules, suited only to perpetuate the vested interests of a status quo.

In view of these considerations, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I salute the teachers of this country who, from Friday, April 5, to Sunday, April 7, are observing Teachers-in-Politics Weekend. Their recognition of, and participation in, the political process as the most effective means of attaining the goals which we desire for our children and ourselves is gratifying to me, both as a politician and as a parent. Not only do teachers constitute one of our most well-informed sources about the edu-

cational requirements of youth, but their active participation in the political life of our Nation will serve as an exemplary model to today's children of the importance of the political process in a democracy. And it is today's children who will be tomorrow's leaders.

"Teachers in Politics" weekend will help to bring public recognition of the fact that teachers, as a group, are becoming more and more politically aware and more and more politically active. Opinion polls run by the National Education Association indicate that teachers themselves have undergone a rapid change of opinion as to their participation in politics. In 1956, only 33 percent thought teachers should be active in politics; in 1964, 67 percent were in favor of an active role. In the November 1964, national elections, nine out of 10 teachers went to the polls as compared to seven out of 10 persons of the general population of voting age. The potential value of active, informed teacher participation in politics is heightened by the fact that this is an election year.

Observances scheduled for the weekend include a variety of activities at the State and local level. Political clinics are being organized in many States to observe the weekend. In New Mexico, a statewide meeting is planned for April 6 in Albuquerque, with participation by the present gubernatorial candidates and a discussion by the State precinct chairman.

I heartily endorse the concept of active, intelligent participation in politics for every American. And I am tremendously proud of the fine effort being launched by teachers throughout the land to make it not the exception, but the rule, for responsible citizens to exercise their freedom of choice not only at the polls, but in the precincts. We can justifiably say that it is a positive response to the challenge of a democratic society that will benefit not only the Nation, but each of our children as well as the teachers who inspire them.

Senator Prouty Lauds Teachers-in-Politics Weekend

HON. WINSTON L. PROUTY

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 5, 1968

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, this weekend the National Education Association in conjunction with its State affiliates will be conducting a nationwide campaign to enlist teacher participation in political matters.

Teachers-in-Politics Weekend is an excellent idea and it shows great promise for the promotion of active participation and will serve to emphasize the important role teachers must continue to play in the political decisionmaking processes.

As the ranking Republican on the Senate Education Subcommittee it has been indeed a great privilege and honor for me to have been directly associated with

the National and State associations in helping to make the 1960's the educational decade of this country. Their help in identifying the educational issues of importance to us on the subcommittee was, in my judgment, the primary reason we were able to enlist such unprecedented attention and support to the task of strengthening and improving education in the United States.

Finally, I wish to express my personal appreciation to the teachers of the Nation for their dedication in discharging their responsibility to equip our children in meeting the challenges of tomorrow.

Discrimination in Employment

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 5, 1968

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, on February 29 in a speech on the floor of the House I outlined the failure of the Federal Government to implement existing powers to curb discrimination in employment. I pointed out that section 101 and section 103(a) of the Model Cities Act require, as a condition of assistance, that model cities funds be used to open up jobs for residents of the target area.

Herbert Hill, national labor director of the NAACP, in a speech in New Orleans on March 30, raised very disturbing questions about the proposed administration of these requirements. The intent of the act is clear. I call upon the responsible administration officials to follow it.

I include at this point excerpts from the address by Herbert Hill, national labor director of the NAACP, and a news story from the Washington Post of Friday, March 29, entitled "NAACP Charges Deal Robs Negroes of Jobs":

EXCERPTS FROM STATEMENT BY HERBERT HILL, NATIONAL LABOR DIRECTOR, NAACP, DELIVERED AT NAACP SOUTHERN REGIONAL CONFERENCE, ROOSEVELT HOTEL, NEW ORLEANS, LA., MARCH 30

The Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 (public law 89-754) known as the Model Cities Program contains the following provisions:

Section 101 of Title I of the Act states that "The Purposes of This Title are . . . to expand housing, job and income opportunities."

Section 103(a) states that "a comprehensive city demonstration program is eligible for assistance . . . only if the program is of sufficient magnitude . . . to make marked progress in reducing social and educational disadvantages, ill health, underemployment, and enforced idleness . . . to serve the poor and disadvantaged in the area."

Section 103 also requires "maximum opportunities for employing residents of the area in all phases of the program and enlarged opportunities for work and training."

It is clear that the purpose of the Model Cities Act is not simply to construct buildings, but also to provide gainful employment for unemployed or underemployed ghetto residents.

We believe that the unemployed residents of the areas affected by the Model Cities Act have priority rights to the jobs created by the expenditure of public funds in the Model Cities Program. This includes new construction as well as rehabilitation work. The word-

ing of the Act is very specific on this point as it requires "Maximum opportunities for employing residents of the areas in all phases of the program and enlarged opportunities for work and training." The Act also states that local residents must be given "priority for jobs created by the expenditure of program funds."

At the present time confidential negotiations are taking place involving the building and construction trades unions of the AFL-CIO, the National Association of Home Builders, the Associated General Contractors, together with other major contractor groups and representatives of United States Government agencies. The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People is in possession of a "Fifth Draft" copy of a proposed "Memorandum of Agreement on Rehabilitation Work" dated March 1, 1968, and designated "For Discussion Purposes Only." If this document becomes the basis for a national agreement between the building trades unions and the contractor associations with the approval and participation of the Federal Government, then unemployed Negro workers living in the ghetto who are intended to be major beneficiaries of the Model Cities Act will be robbed, as they have been so many times in the past, of a full share of the new employment opportunities in publicly financed construction.

An analysis of the "Fifth Draft" of the "Memorandum of Agreement on Rehabilitation Work" dated March 1, 1968, reveals that:

1. The pact would assure the discriminatory building trades unions of rigid control of all rehabilitation work opportunities in the Model Cities Program. These are the same unions that historically and at present continue to exclude Negroes from membership and therefore deny Negro workers employment opportunities in this expanding sector of the national economy.

The Department of Justice has recently initiated litigation in Federal courts against major AFL-CIO construction unions in several cities because of discriminatory racial practices and it would be the height of folly and inconsistency for other agencies of the federal government to further extend the illegal power of discriminatory union job control to the Model Cities Program. All available data reveals that at best there has been a minimal strategic accommodation by the unions to the requirements of civil rights laws and federal executive orders. The abundant evidence makes it very clear that the nationwide pattern of Negro exclusion from the building trades craft unions remains intact. The proposed agreement would for all practical purposes extend the traditional racial employment pattern into the Model Cities Program while fostering the illusion of concessions to the manpower requirements of the act.

2. The proposed agreement creates a new, separate labor classification, that of "Trainee" and this is divided into two groups: "Advanced Trainee" and "Regular Trainee." The Agreement does not require the unions to admit "trainees" to membership. It permits the discriminatory unions to determine who is an "advanced trainee" and who is a "regular trainee" without establishing objective criteria for these classifications. There is no indication in the agreement as to who will determine when a "regular" trainee qualifies for the status of "advanced" trainee.

3. The proposed agreement provides that "trainees" will not receive the fringe benefits given to union members but that "an explicit allowance shall be made in lieu of fringe benefits." The question must be asked, why should "trainees" who will be permitted to work at the discretion of a labor union not be entitled to at least health and welfare insurance coverage and to the same vacation pay as is available to union members. Since it may be anticipated that most of the "trainees" will be residents of ghetto areas,

this is clearly a discriminatory practice which results from the denial of union membership.

4. The proposed agreement states that ratios shall be established between the number of "trainees" and "advanced trainees" in relationship to journeymen, but there is no indication that the present highly restrictive ratios established by the craft unions will be changed. On a national basis, the construction unions have imposed a ratio of one apprentice to every eight journeymen. This means that, at best, an extremely small number of apprentices and an even smaller number of "trainees" will be admitted into the industry as a result of the proposed agreement, which only covers rehabilitation work. Even these very limited "concessions", however, will not apply to new construction. It is necessary to note that rehabilitation work represents a very small fraction of all employment in building and construction.

5. The many thousands of Negro contractors throughout the country who are forced to operate on a non-union basis will be prevented from even bidding for contracts and sub-contracts on Model Cities projects. The Negro owned companies are not members of the contractors associations that are parties to the proposed agreement with the building trades unions. Negro contractors employ many Negro journeymen and apprentices who are denied union membership because of their race and they will be prevented from working on Model Cities rehabilitation and construction work. This is a direct consequence of the exclusive hiring hall arrangements between the craft unions and the construction companies.

6. The proposed agreement provides that "trainees" who will be local residents could receive even lower rates than those indicated by giving them guaranteed work weeks but there is no similar provision that white union members, if they receive guaranteed work weeks, would also have to take wage cuts. This can only be regarded as an example of racial discrimination.

7. The proposed agreement exempts from its coverage "... new construction of public buildings, industrial plants, highways, transportation facilities, other apartments and the like." Furthermore it only applies "... to new construction of low cost housing up to four stories involving financial support of governments in the same or adjacent blocks with rehabilitation projects within the scope of this agreement."

This means that ghetto residents will be excluded from job opportunities in all of the large-scale lucrative new construction which is to be a major part of every Model Cities Program. This is clearly contrary to the intent of the Model Cities Act and indicates the extremely limited nature of the alleged "concessions" made by the building trades craft unions in regard to the legal requirements of the Model Cities Act.

8. Any ghetto resident who desires to make a formal complaint about the administration of the proposed agreement would be required to present his grievances before the very same parties to the contract who are administering the agreement and who will therefore be responsible for the alleged discriminatory practices. The National Labor Relations Board has determined in several cases involving hiring hall procedures that aggrieved individuals can not be forced to seek redress of their grievances before the parties to the hiring hall arrangement. Does this not make the proposed Model Cities Labor agreement grievance procedure also illegal?

9. The proposed agreement explicitly and implicitly in a variety of terms and conditions permits the labor unions to establish union membership as a condition of employment on new construction and permits the unions to determine standards of employment for those admitted as "trainees" in re-

habilitation work under the Model Cities Program. This is clearly a violation of the law.

The National Labor Relations Board in two significant decisions: *Nabokowski and Company and Sheet Metal Workers International Association, AFL-CIO*, Local number 65, Cleveland (1964), and *Astrove Plumbing and Heating Corp. and Local Union number 2 of the United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of the Plumbing and Pipefitting Industry, AFL-CIO*, New York City (1965), held that union membership may not be a condition of employment and that a union can not determine standards for employment. The Board's decisions in the *Nabokowski* and *Astrove* cases makes it absolutely clear that the hiring of a job seeker may not be dependent upon union evaluation of an applicant's competence. Under the National Labor Relations Act only the employer may legally determine a prospective employee's competence.

10. It should be noted that there is nothing in the proposed agreement that requires compliance with the entire body of federal, state and municipal, anti-discrimination laws and Title 29, part 30 of the Department of Labor, Bureau of Apprenticeship Training regulations which requires non-discrimination in the operation of B.A.T. registered apprenticeship training programs.

Significantly there is no mention in the proposed agreement of the Civil Rights assurances contained in the Model Cities Act. Under the provisions of Title I of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, all construction and rehabilitation programs and all other services carried out by cities, states, counties, or other jurisdictions under the provisions of the Act, must be operated in compliance with the requirements of Titles VI and VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Federal Executive Order 11246.

It is evident that the proposed agreement, by virtue of the facts disclosed above, constitutes a direct negation of the concept of equal employment opportunity under the law and the specific requirements of the Model Cities Act. The experience of Negro workers throughout the country for more than four decades has made it absolutely clear that progress in eliminating the broad pattern of racial discrimination within the construction industry can not be made within the existing framework of union controlled "illy white" hiring halls and the illegal closed shop.

Significantly the Model Cities Act goes beyond the passive concept of "equality of opportunity" and requires as a matter of stated public policy "priority" in jobs for unemployed ghetto residents. This point is clearly stated in the Act but the proposed agreement will impose exclusive union hiring halls and illegal closed shops in this sector of public construction which will make meaningless the job priority provisions of the Model Cities Act.

Representatives of the U.S. Department of Labor and of the Department of Housing and Urban Development have a clear obligation to prevent the adoption of the proposed agreement. Obviously as a practical matter the agreement cannot be made operative without the approval and participation of government agencies involved in the administration of the Model Cities Program.

The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People calls upon the responsible Federal officials to publicly reject the proposed agreement and to indicate that the pending agreement or any similar agreement is unacceptable to the United States Government. Failure to do so can only be understood as a further act of administrative nullification of civil rights laws and executive orders by agencies of the federal government who will be spending vast public funds to subsidize racial discrimination.

If this is to be the case then the NAACP

will instruct its local branches and state organizations to initiate litigation in the courts to prevent the Federal Government from subsidizing illegal discriminatory employment practices in public construction projects.

Given the growing racial crisis of America's urban centers, and the recent report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, which concluded that "the pervasive effect" of unemployment and underemployment, "is inextricably linked to the problem of civil disorders," the complicity of government agencies in these matters is nothing short of criminal. High public officials who fail to enforce the law in protecting the rights of Negro citizens are as guilty of breaking "law and order" as those who throw Molotov cocktails on city streets.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,
Mar. 29, 1968]

NAACP CHARGES DEAL ROBS NEGROES OF JOBS

(By George Lardner Jr.)

The NAACP accused the Johnson Administration yesterday of promoting a still secret agreement that would "rob" Negroes of jobs under the Model Cities program.

Herbert Hill, the NAACP's national labor director, said the agreement, still in the final stages of drafting, would turn "rigid control" of hiring over to old-line construction unions with a long history of racial discrimination.

Hill said there was a strong feeling in the Negro protest movement that this is part of the "quid pro quo" between President Johnson and the AFL-CIO, which is working for his re-election.

He called on the Administration to repudiate the plan. Unless the issue is resolved in favor of a "full and fair" share of jobs for Negroes, Hill said, the NAACP will seek court injunctions to block Federal construction funds from going to designated model cities across the country.

On paper, Hill said, the agreement is between the AFL-CIO Building Trades Department and major contractor groups such as the Associated General Contractors and the National Association of Home Builders.

But he said "they couldn't have gone this far without the approval and participation" of Administration officials.

"The complicity of Government agencies in these matters is nothing short of criminal," Hill asserted. "High public officials who fail to enforce the law in protecting the rights of Negro citizens are as guilty of breaking 'law and order' as those who throw Molotov cocktails on city streets."

Under the Model Cities act, slum dwellers are supposed to be given "priority" and "maximum opportunities" for jobs "in all phases of the program" to rebuild their neighborhoods.

The NAACP, Hill said, had obtained a copy of a "fifth draft"—dated March 1—of a proposed national Memorandum of Agreement between the unions and the contractors.

It calls for hiring of slum residents only on residential rehabilitation work and construction of new housing "up to four stories" stemming from rehabilitation projects.

The draft agreement states that it "shall not apply to new construction of public buildings, industrial plants, highways, transportation facilities, other apartments and the like."

Officials from the Departments of Labor and of Housing and Urban Development have been dickering with building trades unionists for months over the "maximum opportunities" clause. The White House is also said to have been keeping a lookout on developments.

However, the Administration was silent yesterday. Hill issued the charges in advance

of a speech he will make in New Orleans Saturday and, as a spokesman for HUD put it, "until we get our hands on (the text), we can't make a comment."

Hill said inquiries he made at HUD confirmed that rehabilitation projects will account for only "a tiny fraction" of the jobs that the Model Cities program will create.

Ghetto residents, he said, "will be excluded from job opportunities in all of the largescale lucrative new construction . . ."

The draft agreement, Hill complained, also fails to require the unions to admit "trainees" from the slums to membership, gives trainees an "allowance" instead of fringe benefits such as health and welfare coverage, and fails to state what the ratio of jobs for slum dwellers is to be.

The agreement also permits "guaranteed work weeks" for trainees instead of regular wage rates or overtime pay.

Thousands of Negro contractors who are now "forced to operate on a non-union basis," Hill also charged, could be prevented from bidding on Model Cities projects since they are not members of the contractors associations that would be parties to the agreement. Consequently, he added, non-union Negro journeymen and apprentices would also be left out in the cold.

A final page of the draft memorandum—entitled "Items for Discussion and Resolution with Federal Government"—suggests that Negro "subcontractors" might be brought into the program "to insure that large scale rehabilitation operations are possible in some key cities."

Under the draft agreement, complaints by ghetto residents about the working of the program would have to be submitted to the local unions and contractors working under supplemental agreements.

Hill suggested that this in itself makes the plan illegal. The National Labor Relations Board, he said, has ruled several times that grievances involving "illy white" hiring halls cannot be automatically shunted off to those who set up and use the hiring halls.

Teachers-in-Politics Weekend

HON. EDWARD W. BROOKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 5, 1968

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, today marks the beginning of what the National Education Association and its constituent State associations have designated as Teachers-in-Politics Weekend. Workshops and other activities are taking place in every State in observance of the Teachers-in-Politics Weekend. As a result, teachers are being exposed to the legislative process and the political arena. The importance of efforts such as this cannot be emphasized enough because they strive to correct an imbalance that exists in many educational institutions between theory, on the one hand, and the practical effects on the other.

The importance of education is fundamental and speaks for itself. It is the vehicle by which free men can travel on the road of advancement to their respective fields of fulfillment. Recent years have brought an even greater awareness of its potential as a vital tool in our efforts to combat the complex and varied problems that confront this Nation.

Unfortunately, much remains to be done before we can realize this potential.

School dropout rates continue to be seriously high. The projections for the 1965-75 period estimate that 2 million pupils may never enter high school and at least another 7 million may not receive diplomas. In light of our increasingly technological world, this figure represents a darkening prospect.

The need for imaginative programs has thus become apparent. Enriched programs are essential to keep students' interests and to plant within them the seeds of desire for a good education that will hopefully ripen into full awareness of the complexities of their existence. This can only come about if the teachers—the guiding influence of the students—have achieved for themselves the awareness necessary to plant the seeds. Their influence cannot be underestimated. The Massachusetts Teachers Association alone boasts a membership in excess of 16,000. To be effective, these teachers must be constantly exposed to the pragmatic aspects of their fields. This exposure can only result in the making of schooling a more meaningful and rewarding experience.

Teachers-in-Politics Weekend is an effort that will result in richer programs in our schools. It will work toward giving the maximum opportunity for all citizens to develop to the fullest their talents, skills, and potential so that they may share in the rewards of our prosperity and freedom.

Teachers-in-Politics Weekend

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 5, 1968

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, often the question is asked: Who should participate in politics? Is politics a tight little political club, with a small selective membership list? Or is it an all-encompassing movement, shouting: Come on in, the water is fine.

On April 5, the National Education Association and its constituent State associations will begin a Teachers-in-Politics Weekend, seeking to stimulate and encourage the participation of our pedagogues in the broad spectrum of politics.

Three cheers, say I. And—it is about time, I add.

I would support strenuously any group seeking greater participation on the political scene—but I can think of no group more needed and better suited than teachers.

Mr. Speaker, I love politics. I have spent most of my adult life in politics, as have most of my colleagues. I think teachers as a group have something real and beneficial to offer in this field.

While as individuals teachers are not new to politics—in fact, some of our committeemen and committeewomen are teachers—as a group, they have not carried their full weight of responsibility.

I say this because as teachers of our children, they owe a responsibility above and beyond the ordinary mortal. Indeed,

if they do not show the way, in involvement in politics, to our youth, who shall?

No one has the right to object to the rules of the game if they refuse to play. Only by their participation can they change those things with which they disagree and bring into our life those things they want but which are lacking presently.

Teachers in Politics, As They Should Be

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 5, 1968

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the last 20 years have brought a vastly increased awareness of the need for, and the benefits of, the best possible educational system. Our society, which has become so dependent upon complex scientific and technologic devices, obviously has a great need for highly trained people to use those devices. A world ever teetering on the brink of disaster as increasing numbers of nations come into possession of the awesome weapons of destruction, needs politicians and diplomats of the highest possible caliber, so skilled in the arts of politics and diplomacy that wars can be reduced to the negotiation table.

Much more than ever before, we live in an age when brains means much more than brawn, when education can mean the difference between survival and destruction, when the intellectual plays an important and vital role in the daily lives of all of us. Education and its agents, teachers, are becoming more and more the sine qua non of our society. We have been slow in our response, however, remaining reticent to give full recognition to the vital role teachers play.

Efforts to reverse the traditional subservience of teachers in the economic structure of our society and to provide teachers with salaries and other benefits commensurate with the tremendous responsibilities they must shoulder are still relatively new. In most communities they still face an uphill battle. Attempts to reverse stereotyped views about the role of teachers in our society have met with too little success. Much too frequently we still tend to think of the teacher as a mousey little lady, so completely dedicated to her profession that she is willing to endure any privation and suffer the derision of a society with which she has ceased to maintain any active contact.

The modern teacher, politically alert, intensely interested in her community and the world, aware of the false image of her and her profession and determined to change it, and often a mother or father and one of the family breadwinners, is probably in no way different from her counterpart of yesteryear. They do differ, however, in that, for the first time, teachers have begun to feel that there is something they can do to improve their lot.

Teachers have come to realize that

there is no reason why they should be expected to be more dedicated, more long-suffering than others, or should accept life in a society only too anxious to receive their services but reticent to pay for them. They have come to realize also that they can do much to induce their communities to improve educational programs, to impress upon their fellow citizens the importance of education, well-qualified teachers, adequate educational facilities, and greater public respect for education and its institutions. The key, they have discovered, is active involvement in politics at all levels. It is the key to better lives for themselves. It is the key to better education for the community. It is the key to a better community.

The Teachers-in-Politics Weekend, to be conducted throughout the Nation this coming weekend, will focus national attention upon the political coming of age of our teachers. It sounds a clarion announcement that teachers too are citizens entitled to all the rights and privileges of citizenship, rights, and privileges which heretofore have been effectively denied them not through any malicious intent but through simple thoughtlessness.

Death of a Great American

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 5, 1968

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, the cruel and senseless assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King has shocked the conscience of America.

A great American who lived by the philosophy of nonviolence, Dr. King brought hope and leadership to the civil rights movement in this Nation. Now he has been struck down by violence—by the assassin's bullet.

It is an incident which will be recorded in history as an act which brought shame to the United States and only the conscience of a great nation can broaden that account in history to include the story of an incident which marked a turning point in man's relationship to his fellow man.

The conscience of the United States—not a white conscience or a black conscience—but an American conscience must now be heard throughout this land. It is very easy for leaders of our Government and for the man in the street to express grief, shock, and sympathy for the family of Dr. Martin Luther King in the wake of this act of murder and bigotry.

The test will not come in our words but in our deeds. The test is not the reaction of the Negro people—it is the reaction of America and Americans.

The test is not who will be the next Negro leader. The test will be who joins in assuming American leadership.

The movement which Dr. King founded and guided will continue and will grow. The test will be the direction which that movement takes, and the

leadership which is given in directing that movement.

The American people—united and true to the principles upon which this Nation was founded—can give new strength to the dream of Dr. Martin Luther King—the American dream.

If we fail to respond—or if we respond without unity, but rather in divisiveness—then freedom and equality will be achieved through another path—a path which Dr. King avoided all his life—a path repugnant to Dr. King and repugnant to the philosophy of non-violence.

The choice is ours—every American's—and we must decide together. It should be an easy decision to make, but the test is whether we make that decision united and firm in the commitment which must be assumed and kept.

Dr. King's brutal slaying has presented this test to the conscience of America and a great nation will see to it that he did not die in vain.

Teachers in Politics

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 5, 1968

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, it is my understanding that early in April the National Education Association and its constituent State associations will observe Teachers-in-Politics Weekend. Anytime that any number of individuals accentuate their activity in politics, I wish to laud them for doing so.

Politics is not a bad word. Politics is the program whereby the job of self-government is carried out. The privileges and opportunities of citizenship also carry grave responsibilities. In our Republic there is no all-wise earthly dictator who will make wise decisions for our country. If the people fail in the job of self-government, self-government fails. A wise man has said that all that is necessary for wrong to rule the day is for good people to do nothing.

It would be my hope that the teachers of America would become active in politics not as a group but as individuals. No individual citizen should permit his thinking on vital public questions to be predetermined by a group or group leaders. The individual citizen should be alert. He should read. He should attend political meetings. He should visit the police department and learn about their problems. If the police permit, he should spend a few nights riding in a police car as they answer the calls. He should go to party caucuses and conventions. The individual citizen should become informed. The individual citizen should put the general good of the country ahead of the special concern of his occupational group, his ethnic group, or his geographical group.

Teachers as individuals can accomplish much for our country by becoming informed about the Nation's foreign problems, military problems, law-and-order problems, agriculture problems,

labor problems, as well as educational problems. Their highest accomplishment will be reached by their intelligent and dedicated performance as a citizen interested in the general welfare.

America cannot endure when the voices of such intelligent and dedicated individuals whose first allegiance is to the general good, is lost in the clamor and noise of the organized groups determined to place their own economic interest first in their participation in politics.

Community Leadership Conference on the Security of the Citizen

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 5, 1968

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, on February 22 I had the pleasure of sponsoring my third annual community leadership conference for the residents of my district. The theme of the conference at the Heights Campus of New York University was "The Security of the Citizen." We were honored to have the distinguished chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], as our principal speaker.

Outstanding members of the bench and bar, government officials, and representatives of the academic community formed five panels to discuss crime prevention, the police, the courts, narcotics, and general problems of security in our community.

Obviously, no single conclusion emerged from all of this. The array of crimes that plague our society like so many diseases can no more be lumped together for diagnosis than can heartburn and heart attacks, the common cold and schizophrenia. But many individual points were made by conference participants that I am sure will be of interest to my colleagues and other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

For this reason, I have had a report prepared summarizing the plenary and panel sessions. I have already entered the keynote address by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] in the RECORD, and, with permission, I insert the report on the remainder of the conference herewith:

OPENING PLENARY SESSION

Dean John W. Knedler Jr. of NYU's Heights Campus greeted the more than 750 conference participants.

Congressman Bingham expressed his thanks to Dean Knedler and the officers and staff of NYU for their hospitality and cooperation in making the conference possible, to co-chairmen Murray Gordon and Colonel Joseph Murtha, and to his congressional staff, the hosts and hostesses and the scores of organizations represented in one way or another at the conference (see attached list).

He explained that the meeting was called because the residents of the community are, to an unprecedented degree, concerned for their personal safety on the streets, in hallways and even in their homes. In many areas, they are afraid to go out at night.

Mr. Bingham continued: "There are those

who try to belittle the problem, to claim that much of it is psychological. Obviously, they have not been in touch with the people of this community. Not long ago at a meeting on Southern Boulevard to which I invited constituents living in the area to hear a report on the 90th Congress—more than half of those present said they personally had been mugged, some of them more than once.

"The title of this conference has two aspects: the citizen has a right to be secure from unlawful arrest or search and from police harassment or brutality; but the citizen also has a right to protection from physical injury. Unfortunately, there is a tendency in some quarters to focus on one aspect and neglect the other.

"There is wide agreement that the root of most violent crimes lies in social degradation, poverty and discrimination, and that the disease, with all of its malignant symptoms, can be wiped out only through the elimination of those conditions. We are only beginning to realize how much we must do in such fields as housing, education, employment and family life.

"But while we seek to uncover and destroy the virus itself, we cannot ignore the symptoms. As President Johnson said in a recent message to Congress, we must continue to attack the root causes of crime, but 'crime will not wait while we pull it up by the roots.'

"The American people will not wait either. We must take immediate steps to protect today's potential victims and restore the security of the citizen. This job is not one simply for the police, the courts and the correctional institutions. In the short run, as well as in the long run, it requires the support and participation of schools, businesses, social agencies, private groups and individual citizens. All of you recognize this truth, or you would not be here today."

Mr. Bingham then introduced Congressman Celler, whose speech on "The Federal Role in the Security of the Citizen" was included in The Congressional Record of February 26.

The first plenary session also included a panel discussion on "Crime Prevention—Basic Strategy" by Dr. Daniel P. Moynihan, director of the Harvard-MIT Center on Urban Studies; Dr. Kenneth B. Clark of the City College of New York, a member of the New York State Board of Regents; and Arnold Sagalyn, associate director for public safety of the President's Commission on Riots.

Dr. Clark recalled that when President Johnson delivered his State of the Union address, Congress applauded most enthusiastically when the President mentioned the problem of "crime in the streets." He said that, in that message, the President devoted 450 words to proposals for dealing with crime and 45 words to civil rights programs and problems.

The principal big-city victims of crime are now and have always been the defenseless residents of low-income areas, Dr. Clark said. Speaking from the perspective of the Negro, and as a person who is trying not to lose faith and hope in the belief that America still has its essential moral and ethical sensitivity, he said, the most obvious new development is that we, as a nation, have become much more alarmed as the percentage of our city population with visibly different skin color increases.

Society has achieved its goal of affluence for the minority groups who came to the cities before the influx of Negroes and Puerto Ricans, and the children of these groups are no longer poor. They are now members of the alarmed and disturbed white middle-class which is so concerned that crime must be controlled. When they refer to the security of the citizen, they are referring to themselves.

These fears of the middle-class and affluent are justified, Dr. Clark said. They reflect the

reality of anger among the poor. The basic problem of our society—one which will not get enthusiastic applause—is the crime that our country, in spite of all its affluence, can doom 20 per cent of society to all of the conditions which lead to crime. The crimes we are concerned with today are due to the conditions of a deeper disease which we probably will not even discuss here, he said.

Mr. Sagalyn commented that the prevention of crime was regarded at one time as a primary objective of the policeman. More than a century ago, it was the policeman's duty to keep his area free of crime. But today, few police departments seem to consider crime prevention either their function or their responsibility. They pay it lip service, while they regard law enforcement as their principal duty. Their men are deployed not to prevent crime but to apprehend those who have already committed crimes. In many departments, the men are rated on the basis of the number of arrests made.

We need only look at the rapidly increasing crime rate to recognize that this approach has been a failure, Mr. Sagalyn said. We are losing the battle. Most communities have less than 100 policemen, and only 19 cities have more than 1,000 policemen. This is a real handicap, but adding a lot more men to police forces is not only very expensive; it is unlikely to have much impact if police continue to approach the problem as they have in the past.

Our efforts must be directed instead to realistic programs which will prevent crime. In every crime two factors are involved: motive and opportunity. Clearly, we cannot do very much to change human behavior. We can, however, greatly minimize the opportunities to commit crime and thereby prevent many crimes by controlling the physical environment in which they occur. Many crimes are situational offenses, i.e., the opportunity presented to a person happening on the scene is so inviting that he cannot resist the opportunity. And thus a crime is committed which would otherwise not have occurred.

Among the steps which Mr. Sagalyn recommended are environmental and physical controls which will make it very difficult to steal a car, to commit a crime on the streets, or in elevators, stair wells, parks and parking lots—where so many of the serious crimes that endanger people occur. These controls also create such a high risk of being spotted, identified and apprehended that the would-be violator is deterred. In this connection we must give attention to the planning, design and construction of buildings, streets, parks and other public places to eliminate or minimize crime-inducing factors now present.

Dr. Moynihan said there is little we know about crime except that it is largely a phenomenon of a lower class, a group of people raised in turbulence. Historically, wherever such people have appeared, there has been crime. He also said it is young males, between their early teens and early 20s, who are involved in most crime. Thus there is a criminally disposed group, and one reason for the fact that there is more crime today is the existence of more young people of lower classes. There is no question that we have learned to associate crime with race as well—in New York City, with Negro and Puerto Rican youths. What is to be done?

We do not have much evidence on how to bring about changes. There have been many efforts, but no conclusive results. There are a number of specific problems in the United States which suggest that dealing with crime will be especially difficult for us.

For one thing, in this country there is a very high level of distaste for the police, especially among liberals. A second problem is that we have a prison system which is backward and barbaric. Dr. Moynihan said he does not know of a more neglected institution in this country. Our judicial system is also in serious trouble, he added. It is tied

up with accident and traffic cases, and in some places civil court cases have had to be suspended entirely in order to permit the system to catch up with the criminal case load.

Other nations like ours have resolved similar difficulties in the past. London, Copenhagen and Paris had the same problems, but they dealt with them successfully by working to eliminate bad housing. In our country, however, we have not learned to deal with the conditions of crime. We must become aware of these conditions of life in the urban setting because the level of violence in our society is rising. Those who are too negligent to notice the lower classes as children will be fully aware of them as men. At least in part, this is a matter of social misinformation much deeper than we have ever experienced before.

The American people, the speaker warned in concluding, may be in grave danger of losing their social stability.

Conference participants then divided into four groups to attend the other panel sessions.

PANEL ON THE POLICE

The question posed for discussion by this panel was, "Are the police unduly hampered?" Conference co-chairman Murray Gordon was the moderator. Panelists were Judge Sidney Asch of the Civil Court of New York City; Patrick V. Murphy, director of public safety for the District of Columbia; and Lee Loughrey, chairman of the division of law and police science at John Jay College of Criminal Justice.

Judge Asch said the police are not so hampered that they cannot achieve reasonable objectives. But he said that if the rules of evidence developed by the courts are unintelligible to the police or not possible to carry out, they cannot protect the citizen from police abuses and should be modified. The effect of recent U.S. Supreme Court decisions on the apprehension and conviction of criminals has been minimal, and reducing crime has little to do with relaxing or tightening rules of evidence.

The policeman is the most visible symbol of authority in our society. As a result, he bears the brunt of complaints that are due to frustration caused by a general evaporation of authority in almost every aspect of community life. But there is little the policeman can do about these basic frustrations. At a time when specialization is needed, the policeman comes out of the tradition of the generalist. We give him a whole range of tasks—to rescue cats, deliver babies, deal with sex mores, pass judgment on complex constitutional issues as well as dealing with emergencies requiring force—but we do not insure that he is equipped with the training, experience and flexibility to do all of this.

What's more, Judge Asch continued, when compared with other professionals, the policeman is less educated and less familiar with the poor and members of minority groups. Frequently he does not have the support of the community where he works, and this alienation tends to inculcate a feeling of "them against me."

For any meaningful resolution of our problems, we must change the values of everyone in our society, not just blame the policeman. In the short run, moreover, it is necessary to recognize that the police cannot do everything. Many of the functions they are now called upon to do, such as school discipline, illness on the streets, licensing, social work and routine clerical tasks, should be turned over to the appropriate specialists such as doctors, social workers and psychiatrists.

The functions that are reasonably left to the police can be dealt with more effectively only if the police receive better pay and training. In addition, police departments should be organized on separate "tracks" so that personnel who are specialists can get into specialist ratings without going through

the slow, tortuous process of advancement from foot patrolman.

Mr. Murphy remarked that both affluence and poverty in our society underlie crime. In our increasingly affluent country, the increase in crime has been against property, not against the person.

Most policemen use their great power with discretion, he said. But this power is sometimes misused, which may account for the Supreme Court decisions restricting police practices. Police do not have enough prestige or community support, nor do they show the professional development of other parts of the criminal justice system. For example, there are 40,000 police departments in the country—uncoordinated and having little communication with one another, even within a single state.

Thus there is a need for higher standards, professional training and education of policemen at all levels.

The D.C. public safety director also explained a new plan which the District Police Department is using to promote innovations and evaluation of new techniques. Each precinct, he said, makes monthly reports on crime figures, while smaller units within the precincts (seven or eight block areas) make similar reports on a weekly basis.

Mr. Loughrey said that fear for their own security had brought the participants to the conference. He complained that the courts have forgotten the victims of crime. To punish the policeman for brutality or other abuses, the criminal is set free to resume his illegal activities. The rulings of the U.S. Supreme Court appear to indicate that the justices feel a person who confesses to a crime must have been coerced by police violence.

The speaker was also critical of the demands on a policeman's time such as filling out detailed reports. Excessive paperwork and administrative detail may leave too little time for crime prevention and detection, he said.

Question period

Question. What is your opinion of the Patrolman's Benevolent Association request for 5,000 additional patrolmen?

Answer. Mr. Loughrey said additional men are needed to take the place of those on sick leave and court leave and to compensate for the shorter (40-hour) week.

Question. Why won't the public get involved in preventing crimes?

Answer. Mr. Loughrey said the public must be educated about how they can help their law enforcement officials.

PANEL ON THE COURTS

Members of this panel, which discussed the question of whether the courts are too lenient, were Justice Arthur Markewich of the New York State Supreme Court; Russell Oswald, chairman of the New York State Parole Commission, and Burton Roberts, chief assistant district attorney for the Bronx. Judge J. Howard Rossbach of the New York City Criminal Court served as moderator.

Mr. Roberts said the crime increase is not just cold statistics but hard facts. There was a 25 per cent increase in indictments in Bronx County from 1966 to 1967. Since it is not possible for the courts to keep pace with this caseload, they often resort to reduced charges and sentences. Because the courts do not have adequate manpower or facilities, they have, of necessity, been lenient in cases where leniency was not merited. The blame should be placed not on the courts but on the failure of the State legislature to increase the number of judges available to try cases.

The speaker was also critical of the correctional system. There has been very little research done on crime, including what causes it in a psychological or behavioral sense and how we can prevent it. Fifteen to 25 per cent

of those accused of crimes are psychopaths, but there is little or no research in this area. We have not provided psychiatric correctional facilities to deal with these individuals.

The purpose of criminal justice is not revenge. It is to deter others from committing crimes and to rehabilitate those who have committed crimes. The new penal law in New York State provides a rational system of sentencing, with punishments geared not only to fit the crime but more importantly to fit the individual. There is greater flexibility in parole board operations as well as in sentencing.

But more money is still needed in the correctional system. For example, the prisoners at Rikers Island have a fourth or fifth grade reading level. They need more educational facilities. They should not be allowed to languish away.

Prison will not solve the problem of crime. There is no easy solution, and we must search for an answer with light rather than with heat. Above all, we must reach into our pockets and provide the necessary funds, Mr. Roberts said, in order to enable our courts and correctional institutions to do the job.

Mr. Oswald said that in trying to determine whether we are too soft with criminals, it is necessary first to say who is the "we" in our question. Does the "we" refer to those who have in no way contributed to the phenomenon of criminality? Does it exclude the advertising man more interested in selling his product than in the truth, the newspaperman more concerned about sensation than the effect of his stories, the movie and TV producers specializing in stimulating criminal tendencies, the parents and schools which have neglected to instill proper attitudes and concepts in children?

Actually, we all share some degree of responsibility, and the problem of improving our youthful and adult criminals is also the problem of improving ourselves, Mr. Oswald remarked.

He said punishment, as distinguished from revenge, is a rational rather than an emotional activity. It is aimed at achieving a certain end, and any evaluation of its softness or harshness must be based on how well it achieves this end. But the question of "ends" is a very complex one. One broad school of thought maintains that punishment acts as a deterrent, while another school claims that its real goal is to prevent the repetition of crime by the individual who has already committed a crime. The idea that the more atrocious the punishment, the more deterrent its effect, has not worked in practice. People become used to things, even to executions, and they cease to deter. It is not the severity of the punishment but the certainty of it that is important, and this is based on community attitudes and the efficiency of the police and the courts.

Mr. Oswald also said that we have come to expect increased crime in a period of affluence, when expectations are large and frustration and anger are natural reactions for those who are left behind.

Justice Markewich answered the question of whether the courts are too lenient with a "no." Sentencing is not usually automatic for a particular crime, but is tailored to the individual, which is why you need a judge rather than a clerk. It is necessary to purge society of those people who are incapable of living in society, who make serious nuisances of themselves or who constitute dangers to everyone else. Severity of punishment in the form of long prison terms is sometimes necessary when it is for the public good. The judge is the instrument of society.

But rehabilitation must be chosen whenever a judge has the choice. Here, the problem is one of finding the suitable agency or means for rehabilitation. There must also be people available to look after and guide criminals who are placed on probation instead of being sent to prison.

Rehabilitation cannot make up for a lack of proper parental teaching, but the job of protecting the community must be given to corrections, parole and probation officers when the parents fail. When probation also fails, the judge has the problem of what to do with a violator. Usually, he must send him to jail, giving up hope of rehabilitation.

The justice said he believes in short sentences coupled with long periods of supervision under parole. The probability of punishment, he said, is not a real deterrent against crime; the criminal does not consider this because he does not believe he is going to be caught.

PANEL ON NARCOTICS

The panel on narcotics, with State Senator Abraham Bernstein as moderator, discussed whether addicts can be controlled. Members were George M. Belk, district supervisor for the federal Bureau of Narcotics; Laurence Pierce, chairman of the New York State Narcotics Commission; and Dr. V. P. Dole, originator of the Methadone Program, senior physician to the hospital of Rockefeller University.

Mr. Belk remarked that it is common for a society, when it determines that a practice is undermining the health of its citizens, to call on the law as an ally of medicine. Narcotic drug addiction is a sociological and medical problem. It is also a legal problem. Arguments about whether addicts are basically sick people or criminals serve no useful purpose and obstruct progress.

There is still a need to educate more doctors to assume leadership in bringing addicts through the long, difficult process of treatment and cure. But the growing interest of the medical profession in exploring medical solutions to addiction is heartening. At the same time, the federal government has a new law—the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966—which affords more opportunities for the treatment of addicts and assistance for the states in their efforts. For example, certain addicts charged under federal law may be permitted to elect commitment to the Surgeon General for treatment in lieu of prosecution, and certain addicts who have been convicted of federal crimes may be sentenced to commitment for treatment for an indefinite period (not to exceed 10 years).

The act also separates marijuana offenders from narcotics violators by making persons convicted of marijuana violations and serving mandatory sentences eligible for parole.

It may not be in the nature of social problems that there will ever be an absolute answer to the addiction problem. Controls alone are not enough. Many other steps have not been taken that could help prevent the continuance of a bad situation. Governments have not done enough to prevent addiction by alleviating the degradation of poverty, the decay of our cities, the disgrace of discrimination and the despair of illiteracy. And they have not taken adequate measures to treat and rehabilitate narcotic addicts properly. But I am encouraged that a great deal is now being done, Mr. Belk added.

Mr. Pierce said that narcotics addicts are responsible for much of the crime which occurs in New York City, especially crimes against property. The implication is that if we can control the addict, the crime rate should decline commensurately. This conclusion raises questions about reported rates of "cure" for narcotic addiction and about relapse rates. Studies suggest that control of addiction is possible, but the degree varies greatly. It is important to pursue the possibility of "abstinence," but consideration should also be given to other approaches such as control through the supervised administering of drug substances.

New York State has embarked upon a massive attack on addiction on four fronts: prevention through education, treatment and rehabilitation, research and evaluation and law enforcement. The state Narcotic

Commission has the responsibility for the first three of these programs. The commission's policy is that there is not likely ever to be a single method of treating and rehabilitating all addicts. Thus, it is seeking to develop a variety of approaches. Altogether, the various programs which it operates provide treatment and rehabilitation services for more than 5,000 addicts, mainly from New York City.

The principal new contribution of the state commission is the development of a substantial aftercare program. This enables the commission to continue its program of rehabilitation after the addict has progressed sufficiently to be returned to his community. He is provided with the kind of support and assistance which may enable him to resist the temptation to resume drug use, Mr. Pierce said.

Dr. Dole described the Methadone Treatment Program of supervised, controlled administration of the synthetic drug methadone to addicts who are unable to abstain completely from drug use. At the present time, he said, 650 former hardcore criminal heroin addicts are in treatment. Before they joined the program, these individuals cost society \$25,000 to \$50,000 per year per person, not including the social costs of destroyed families, abandoned children and wasted talents. Many of them now are decent citizens.

Weekly chemical tests are used to make sure patients do not relapse to narcotics use. In addition, systematic reports on behavior, health and employment of all patients are obtained at weekly intervals from counsellors and physicians. The records of these tests show that methadone treatment has stopped the ex-addicts' heroin seeking and has greatly reduced criminal behavior.

But it is no panacea for addiction. The patients must want treatment. There are no residence facilities, and the people treated must be able to live in the community as ordinary citizens during treatment. For some addicts, this is too much to demand. But 89 per cent of the addicts who started treatment on methadone have remained in the program without the aid of prolonged psychiatric treatment. Some of the other 11 per cent undoubtedly would have been better off with institutional care.

Crime has been reduced significantly among the participants. During an experience of four years, there have been three convictions for felonies, 35 for misdemeanors and five for lesser offenses. On the basis of their prior records, these same individuals would have been expected to have at least 400 convictions.

But there are not enough facilities to treat every addict who applies, and 500 addicts already accepted for the program are still on the streets, living by crime, for want of treatment facilities. If substantial progress is to be made, Dr. Dole said, we must also find ways to bring more doctors into the field of treating narcotics addicts.

Question Period

Question (by Senator Bernstein). Would you discuss the increasing use of marijuana in colleges and high schools and the movement to legalize its use on the grounds that it is no worse than alcohol or smoking?

Answer. Mr. Pierce said one should not introduce any drug into the system without knowing its consequences upon the mind and body. There isn't much solace in relating the problem to alcohol. There are 600,000 alcoholics in New York City and six or seven million in the United States. We don't know how many marijuana users become addicts, but it is certain that those who do suffer the same kind of consequences as alcoholics.

Question. Why wait until narcotics users become mainliners before treating them? Most heroin users graduate from a lesser narcotic, do they not?

Answer. Mr. Pierce agreed and said the

state commission has responsibilities for research and prevention as well as treatment of addicts. He and Mr. Belk cited various programs, including information and education in the schools, sponsored or supported by the state and federal governments. In its 20 months of existence, the commission has distributed 150,000 pieces of literature about the drug problem and has completed two films, one for high school youngsters. The federal Narcotics Bureau has a speakers' bureau to address young people, PTAs and other groups. The bureau also has films available for young audiences.

Question. Is there anything churches and community organizations can do to help with this problem?

Answer. Mr. Pierce said both city and state are prepared to cooperate with these groups. There are many things groups can do in terms of public education.

Question (by Senator Bernstein). It has been said that methadone, a synthetic drug, is addictive in and of itself. Is that so?

Answer. Dr. Dole said methadone, properly used, produces a blockade that makes opiates ineffective for the user. Patients get no narcotic effect or euphoria. They cannot be distinguished from normal people and do not have the symptoms of addicts.

Question. Are you advocating a witch hunt for people who use drugs or are you willing to treat them as sick people?

Answer. Treat them as sick people, Senator Bernstein said. I advocate confinement, psychotherapy, group therapy, educational programs and rehabilitation of all types so they can readjust to their community when they are released from the rehabilitation center.

Question. How long is it necessary to test marijuana in order to find out whether it is harmless? The U.S. Army has been testing it since 1910 and has found it no more harmful than alcohol.

Answer. Senator Bernstein said all medical indications are that marijuana does create psychological changes and may lead to emotional dependency. Based upon this evidence, you cannot conclude it is harmless, and until it is proven harmless I will oppose any legalization of it.

Question (by Dr. Dole). What am I to do about the addicts desperately wanting to get into our methadone program? Shall I tell them it will not be available for two years, or can I get more facilities?

Answer. Mr. Belk said he is not too sure he would like to see another 500 methadone addicts. "Besides, it is my opinion—and the position of the U.S. government—that methadone is a research program and has still to prove itself before it can be expanded."

PANEL ON GENERAL PROBLEMS OF SECURITY

This open discussion session was chaired by State Senator Harrison J. Goldin and Edmond Rovner, administrative assistant to Congressman Bingham.

Question. What kind of federal programs are being set up to halt violence in the ghetto?

Answer. Mr. Rovner said a great deal is being done, for example the summer job programs, but much of the responsibility must rest with local governments.

Question. What is being done to help police forces deter crime?

Answer. Mr. Rovner mentioned, as a short-range program, the President's proposed Safe Streets and Crime Control Bill, which would provide federal assistance for state and local police forces, and, as a long-range federal effort to deal with crime, the whole spectrum of antipoverty programs.

Question. If crime has economic roots, what economic programs have actually been established?

Answer. Mr. Rovner listed the Office of Economic Opportunity, job training, public and publicly assisted housing and job crea-

tion as some examples of federal programs.

Statement. Senator Goldin discussed a new state law which requires landlords to provide a functioning bell-and-buzzer system if 50 per cent of their tenants request it. He said this could help in reducing burglaries, assaults and other crimes.

Statement. The breakdown in law and order is not difficult to understand; Congress has not even passed legislation covering its own ethics.

Question. Is there really a link between crime and poverty?

Answer. Mr. Rovner said the President's Crime Commission studies conclude that crime in the streets and poverty are linked.

Statement. The problem is that there is not enough police protection. More respect for the police is needed. Something must be done to end the animosity between white policemen and Negro citizens.

Statement. A state of war now exists between Negroes and whites in America. There are tremendous pressures.

Statement. Spokesmen for the Congress of Senior Citizens praised Mr. Bingham's efforts in Congress on behalf of senior citizens. They said 28 per cent of the poor in New York are elderly persons. These people are poor but law-abiding.

Statement. A spokesman for the Junior Chamber of Commerce supported responsible gun control legislation.

Statement. A spokesman for the Bronx Draft Information and Counseling Service said the war in Vietnam is draining America's resources. It is urgent to resolve this conflict in order to be able to resolve our domestic problems.

Statement. The New York State Human Rights Law contains unintentional discrimination and should be rewritten to eliminate this shortcoming.

CONCLUDING PLENARY SESSION

The principal speaker at the final plenary session of the conference was Bronx Borough President Herman Badillo.

Mr. Badillo said the rate of crime in the Bronx is about average for New York City, but crime is much more prevalent in slum areas of the South Bronx than in the upper income Riverdale section. Not only do most of the victims of crime live in poor neighborhoods; these people feel the need for increased police protection most strongly. They are not at all apathetic about the crime problem.

In the South Bronx, he said, there is inadequate police protection because policemen are afraid. They are no different from the rest of us; they don't want to risk their lives when the odds are heavily against them. We can't blame them for this feeling. The one-man patrol car just doesn't conform to reality, especially in slum neighborhoods. It is necessary to push for additional manpower in these areas so the police can patrol in groups of at least two men.

The reality of life in the slums during the summer, the borough president said, is comparable to being on the beach on a hot day with no water and with all of your clothes on. It is impossible to sleep in unbearably hot apartments, and residents have nothing to do except sit on their front stoops drinking beer well into the night. There is nothing criminal about this, but it results in situations which lead to incidents which may lead in turn to riots.

What can be done? It is worse than useless to talk about tearing down the slums when there is not one cent in the city or state budgets to build low-cost housing. The only available money comes from the federal government, and New York City is limited to 7,500 units a year, compared to the present waiting list of 135,000 families. The situation with respect to job training and special educational programs is much the same. Talk about grand schemes for action

in these fields only arouses unrealistic expectations when there are no funds.

Mr. Badillo appealed to his listeners to work actively to secure financial support for housing, job training and education instead of just talking about what should be done. Beyond that, he said, let us work on the limited things we can do with existing resources, such as simply clearing the garbage from our streets a block at a time.

There are many other small things that each of us can do. When we are working in these ways, then we can begin to answer the arguments of the black and white separatists. Then we can begin to forge a new civil rights coalition.

Congressman Bingham closed the conference by summarizing some of the many viewpoints which were expressed at the various sessions. In spite of many disagreements, he said, there were also certain themes that emerged: that the problems of dealing with crime are exceedingly complex and there are no "gimmicks" or simple solutions; that the struggle against crime must proceed on many levels at once, including basic social and economic problems, racial prejudice and the immediate tasks of providing greater security in the community; that in all of these activities there is a need for additional funds, more trained personnel and better understanding and cooperation between the police and other government agencies on the one hand and private organizations and citizens on the other.

To achieve a greater degree of safety for our citizens, he said, the pressing needs are for more manpower, increased training and education, better pay and improved equipment and facilities for police, courts and correctional systems. Surely, responsible citizens (no matter what their political views) can agree with police officials on the importance of moving decisively to meet some of these requirements for more effective law enforcement.

For Americans who consider themselves "liberals," the Congressman said, the need for action is especially great. He continued:

"At a time of rising public concern, the issue of crime in the streets could become a major weapon in a serious bid for power by elements of the far right—replacing such traditional rightwing battle cries as 'communist subversion.' To date, the liberal community has left this field almost entirely to the conservatives.

"State and local communities, which have always had the primary responsibility for enforcement and corrections—and rightly so—should provide most of the financial support for improved police, judicial and correctional services. It is obvious, however, that the task requires substantially greater resources than state and municipal budgets can provide. Assistance from the federal government will be required on a scale far greater than has been envisaged so far."

Mr. Bingham said the President has taken a long step in the right direction with his Safe Streets and Crime Control Bill, introduced in Congress last year. He urged the citizens organizations represented at the conference to make their voices heard in favor of this bill, the proposed Firearms Control Bill and other legislation discussed by Congressman Celler. He also asked them to work for the additional funds for police work which Borough President Badillo so eloquently advocated.

Participating in the conference were officers, representatives and members of many institutions, organizations, and community groups, including the following:

American Jewish Congress; Bronx General Division; Bronx Women's Division; West Bronx Chapter.

American Legion, John Fraser Bryan and McNally Posts.

American Veterans Committee.

Ancient Order of Hibernians.

Arthur Murphy Tenants Association.
 Association for Help of Retarded Children.
 Association of Community Organizations.
 Association of Jewish Court Attachés.
 Bainbridge Neighborhood Association.
 Bedford Park Civic Association.
 Beth Abraham Hospital.
 Benjamin Franklin Reform Democratic Club.
 Better Organization in Mid-Bronx B'nai B'rith; Bernard Mogilesky Lodge; Inwood Chapter; Riverdale Chapter; Skyview Lodge.
 Board of Education.
 Board of Higher Education.
 Bronx Boys Club.
 Bronx Community College.
 Bronx Consultation Center.
 Bronx County Bar Association.
 Bronx House.
 Bronx Grand Jurors Association.
 Bronx High School of Science.
 Bronx Juvenile Court.
 Bronx Pelham Reform Democratic Club.
 Bronx Post Office.
 Bronx Protestant Council.
 Bronx Therapeutic Council.
 Bronx Young Democrats.
 Bronxwood Advisory Council.
 Catholic Inter-racial Council.
 Catholic War Veterans.
 Chester Civic Improvement Association.
 Christ Episcopal Church.
 Christopher Columbus High School.
 Church of the Mediator High School.
 Church of the Holy Spirit.
 Church of the Visitation Mother's Club.
 Civic Center of Israel.
 Civic Improvement Association of Northeast Bronx.
 Columbus Evander Youth and Adult Center.
 Columbus Esca Alliance.
 Community Planning Board No. 5.
 Creston Avenue Baptist Church.
 Decatur Democratic Club.
 Democratic Organization of Latin American Countries.
 Dodge Vocational High School.
 East Tremont Child Care Center.
 East Tremont Neighborhood Association.
 Evander Childs High School.
 Franklin D. Roosevelt Independent Democratic Club.
 Fordham Civic Association.
 Fordham Heights Community Organization.
 Fordham Lutheran Church.
 Fordham University.
 Frances Schervier Home.
 Free Sons of Israel.
 Fort Tryon Jewish Center.
 Girl Scouts of America.
 Good Shepherd Parish.
 Hadassah: Balfour, Brandeis, Pelham Parkway, Tel Aviv Groups.
 Holy Spirit School.
 Horace Mann High School.
 Hunter College.
 Immaculate Conception Church.
 Inwood-Marble Hill New Frontier Democrats, Inc.
 Jewish Center of Williamsbridge.
 John F. Kennedy Independent Democratic Club.
 Junior High Schools Nos. 44, 45, 79, 135, 141, 143.
 Kingsbridge Heights Jewish Center.
 Knights of Columbus.
 Knights of Pythias.
 Knolls Community Council.
 League of Women Voters.
 Little League Baseball Inc., District 23.
 Local School Boards Nos. 10, 11.
 Marble Hill Tenants Association.
 Manhattan College.
 MARK: Committee for Civil Rights.
 Messiah Lutheran Church.
 Monterey Community Association.
 Mosholu Civic Association.
 Mosholu Montefiore Community Center.

Mount Saint Ursula High School.
 Narcotics Institute Program, Haryou ACT, Inc.
 National Council of Churches.
 National Council of Jewish Women.
 National Association of Retired Civil Employees.
 National Association of Social Workers.
 New York City Department of Social Services.
 New York City Police Department: 7th Division; 34th, 46th, 48th, 50th precincts.
 New York City Speech Correction Teachers Association.
 New York State Narcotic Addiction Control Commission.
 Northeast Independent Democratic Club.
 O.R.T.
 Our Lady of Mercy Convent.
 Our Lady of Refuge—Holy Name Society.
 Our Saviour Lutheran Church.
 Parkside Day Center.
 Pelham Parkway Jewish Center.
 34th Precinct Community Council.
 46th Precinct Community Council.
 52nd Precinct Community Council.
 Presidents Council: School Districts 6 and 10.
 Port Authority Police Benevolent Association, Inc.
 Public Schools Nos. 7X, 24, 26, 41, 46, 57, 67X, 78, 91, 97, 122, 189.
 Riverdale Council on Youth.
 Riverdale Country School.
 Riverdale Merchants Association.
 Riverdale Neighborhood House.
 Riverdale-Yonkers Society for Ethical Culture.
 Sacred Heart of Mary Academy.
 Jacob H. Schiff Center.
 St. Edmund's Church, Men's Guild.
 St. Elizabeth Church, Holy Name Society.
 St. Francis of Assisi.
 St. Gabriel School.
 St. Mary's Church, Holy Name Society.
 St. Margaret Mary School.
 St. Nicholas of Tolentine.
 St. Philip Neri School.
 St. Simon Stock Church.
 St. Stephen's Methodist Church.
 Tremont Methodist Church.
 Theodore Roosevelt High School.
 University Heights Community Association.
 University Heights Presbyterian Church.
 Victory Day Care Center.
 Walton High School.
 Washington Avenue Neighborhood Association.
 West Bronx Council.
 William Hodson Community Center.
 Workmen's Circle, Branch 1082.
 Yeshiva University.
 Young Israel of Kingsbridge.
 Young Republican Club.
 Zionist Organization of America.

Teachers-in-Politics Weekend

HON. EDMUND S. MUSKIE

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 5, 1968

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I was pleased to learn that the National Education Association has designated the weekend of April 5 to 7 as Teachers-in-Politics Weekend. This weekend, which will be observed throughout the country, is designed to focus the attention of teachers, parents, and politicians on the importance of recognizing that educational policy decisions are political decisions and that educators must take an active role in helping shape those decisions.

I am happy that the Maine Teachers Association will participate in Teachers-in-Politics Weekend. Never before has our Nation required a higher degree of citizen participation in politics—at the local, State, and National levels. Each individual should feel he has a definite role in shaping local institutions and local policy. Teachers-in-Politics Weekend will help in shaping local policy. By encouraging teachers to take an active interest in politics the National Education Association is performing a valuable public service.

The Federal Highway Beautification Act of 1965—A Fraud

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 5, 1968

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the Washington State Roadside Council has been one of the most active groups in the country working for scenic highways, parks, bicycle and hiking trails, billboard control, and underground wiring.

In this connection, the roadside council had a deep interest in the Federal Highway Beautification Act of 1965. The council predicted when the act was passed that it would be a disaster, and would actually retard highway beautification, and now, in its newsletter No. 13, it points out that this is just the case. I believe Members of Congress and other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will find these comments of interest.

The full text of the article follows:

THE FEDERAL HIGHWAY BEAUTIFICATION ACT OF 1965 IS A FRAUD

The Federal Highway Beautification Act of 1965 in so far as it applies to billboard control is a fraud because of the circumstances of its passage, because of its language which actually calls for the promotion of billboards, because it encourages billboard alleys at the entrances to the cities and towns on the major highways, because it upsets the existing sign control programs in the states, because the Act makes it virtually impossible for the states to have a better law, and because it does violence to the public's expectations. Also, the other parts of the federal law which apply to screening of junkyards and roadside improvement have major defects and crippling loopholes.

The Washington Post said in an editorial on May 10, 1967:

"The Highway Beautification Act, as it applies to outdoor advertising, has turned out to be one of the most disappointing statutes Congress ever enacted. It was known at the time the bill was enacted in 1965 that it contained some striking defects. Now some of the legislators who are most interested in protecting highways from unsightly distractions are saying that the law is worse than no law at all. In some states it will actually create billboard advertising where none existed before."

This is strong language but the record backs it up.

Three years ago President Johnson sent a special message to Congress on Natural Beauty. Some of the proposals, like the ones to combat pollution of various sorts, had been around for years, and some were new. The remarkable feature of the President's program was its "packaging." Take difficult

problems like water pollution, air pollution, billboards, junkyards, mining scars and honky-tonk seashores and put them all together, and say that the issue is beauty, and who can come out for making the country uglier?

To give the beautification program a proper launching, President Johnson in May 1965, sponsored a special White House conference. Several people from the Roadside Council were among the 800 delegates to the conference. The White House Conference on Natural Beauty was no bed of roses—it turned out to be a shambles. Many went away angry. There was widespread disappointment that the conference talked about how nice it would be to have posies by the roadside, and pretty buildings instead of ugly buildings, but avoided such harder questions as to how to keep highway departments and the Bureau of Public Roads from paving their way through parks.

The conference started out with no more eager participants than the representatives of the garden clubs and the citizens' roadside councils throughout the country, who had for years been waging lonely battles against billboard interests and highway departments, and who now found that their cause was all the rage. They did not claim to have invented beauty, but they did feel that they had earned a leadership role. As they soon learned, this was not to be. The conference staff had apparently decided in advance what the results of the two day conference were going to be. The staff had prepared draft copies of the reports, which, based on what transpired subsequently, the conferees were expected to rubber stamp.

The roadside beauty panel received a draft proposal of their report, drawn up in advance by the conference staff. The panelists were appalled to find that the prospective report contained "goodies" that the billboard interests had been trying to peddle to state legislatures for years without success.

It has come out that an employee of the Department of Commerce, who was one of the Conference staff members associated with drafting the roadside panel report, had been negotiating for two years with billboard operators to draft legislation which the billboard interests would support (Washington Post, March 28, 1965). That staff member, Lowell K. Bridwell, is now the Federal Highway Administrator.

The effect of one provision of the report would be the exemption from billboard regulation of the roadsides along the entrances and through the downtown areas of the cities and towns on the nation's principal highways. These areas are the "front doors" and "portals" of the nation and areas where billboards naturally collect and which caused the demand for billboard legislation to start with. As the national headquarters of the American Automobile Association has pointed out:

"Control of roadside advertising in the areas of interchanges in municipal and metropolitan areas is vitally important to the effectiveness of official routing and traffic control signs—more imperative probably, than in rural areas. Traffic flow and safety is jeopardized when motorists must cope with uncontrolled competition of commercial advertising and official signs near interchanges on high speed expressways."

After a heated debate among the panelists, in which the delegates on the floor also participated, the panel report was revised to state that the majority of the panelists felt that the entire length of the new Interstate freeways and the primary road systems should be protected from the indiscriminate placement of billboards. The single vote against the panel position was by a billboard company representative from Waco, Texas, who stated from the speakers platform that this was "not far from the Pedernales River."

Later that afternoon when the conferees

were gathered in the East Room of the White House to witness the final presentation of the several panel reports to the President, the delegates were again appalled to hear the original staff-prepared roadside report, not their own hard line, being read to the President (Washington Post, May 27, 1965).

The last straw came when the President announced, to the delegates, that a news release had already been made that morning revealing his highway beauty bill—a bill which contained the original language favored by the billboard interests. Concluding that the "jig was up", the roadside beauty lovers shrugged their shoulders, put on their hats and went home (Washington Post, May 27, 1965). Not a few were outraged to realize that their presence at the Conference on Natural Beauty was mere window dressing for a program which had been decided upon prior to the conference. From that time on they would have nothing to do with the Administration bill.

The final blow was to come when Congress further weakened the legislation by:

(1) Including in the beautification act the stated objective of promotion of outdoor advertising.

(2) Requiring the states to pay for any billboards made illegal by state legislation, with the federal government picking up the tab for 75 percent of the costs.

Observers were charmed to notice that billboard company lobbyists and others allied with them were working closely with the Administration representatives to get the law passed.

For decades state and local governments have regulated billboards under their zoning laws and the courts have backed them up. Firmly established by legal decisions handed down in many states are the principles that:

(1) Outdoor advertising is essentially a use of the public highways, rather than a bona fide use of the land.

(2) When a reasonable period for amortization has been completed, non-conforming billboards may be classed as a public nuisance and may be required to be removed under the state's zoning powers.

Enactment of good sign ordinances is certain to be retarded. Pressures are intense on law-makers at all levels, and whenever an effective sign ordinance is enacted, it is only after a long, hard struggle—nearly always by a close vote. Add an indeterminate public expense to buy billboards, on top of the other arguments employed by the foes of billboard control, and the scales will swing heavily against ordinances requiring removal of non-conforming signs. It may be a thing of the past.

Further, we and many other people object to ransoming back the scenery that belongs to the public by right. It seems elementary that the public that built the roads has the right to view the scenery that those roads open up. The most charitable thing that can be said for the congressional action was that the subject was complex and they did not know what they were doing.

Four of the seven Washington State congressmen voted against the federal Highway Beautification Act of 1965, as did all of Oregon's congressmen, even though the White House pulled out all stops to pass the new legislation. Here are excerpts from statements of the four Washington State congressmen who opposed the new federal law:

"The Federal Billboard Act might disrupt our excellent Washington State Act which is a better law than the one Congress passed. This bill did not provide sufficient safeguards for states such as ours which have pioneered in this field. It also opens a Pandora's box of litigation." (Representative BROCK ADAMS, Seventh District.)

"Attempts were made by delegation members from Washington and Hawaii to clarify the legislative history during debate with the aim of protecting more stringent bill-

board restrictions imposed by many states. It was my judgment that the bill was hastily drawn and considered, that its cost will be vastly more than anticipated, and that, in many respects, it will constitute a regressive influence." (Representative THOMAS S. FOLEY, Fifth District.)

"... On an issue of vital importance to the State of Washington, the opportunity to present the facts and explain an amendment was almost nil. Instead, there was an arbitrary steam roller type of operation in action under orders from the White House which swept aside all attempts to improve or alter the bill... Now it seems this new Federal law will create serious constitutional problems for the State and disrupt our program that has proven so effective." (Representative THOMAS M. PELLY, First District.)

"The bill was replete with unworkable, unwise, and unfair provisions. Many state governments, including our State of Washington, complained it would thwart already comprehensive state beautification laws by unjustly imposing financial penalties and legal difficulties impossible to overcome. Governor Evans of our State, after receiving advice from the State Attorney General's Office and the State Highway Department, warned that the bill directly conflicts with Washington zoning laws and would open a 'Pandora's box' of litigation and require unwarranted public expenditures. The Governor pointed out that the proposed Federal exemption of highway signs in commercial and industrial areas is directly counter to the protection against such signs presently written into Washington State law. 'If this bill passes and supersedes our State law it would be a step backwards,' the Governor cautioned, and added, 'The State of Washington neither needs nor wants this type of legislation.'" (Representative CATHERINE MAY, Fourth District.)

Two and one-half years have now passed since Congress passed the Highway Beautification Act of 1965. Even so, only ten states have signed agreements with the Secretary of Transportation to regulate billboards pursuant to the federal law. Forty states, Washington State included, continue to ignore the federal law even though the law provided for a noncompliance penalty of ten percent of the federal-aid highway funds beginning January 1, 1968. However, with this evidence of lack of support for the federal law, the Secretary of Transportation has announced that he is holding the penalty provisions in abeyance.

On March 20, 1967, Rep. John C. Kluczynski, Chairman, and Rep. William C. Cramer, ranking minority member, of the Subcommittee on Roads of the congressional House Public Works Committee, stated in a news release:

"It is unfortunate, but in our opinion true, that the Act is not susceptible of successful administration, and we believe that if we are to preserve the highway beautification program in which we are all vitally interested, we should recognize that fact and revise the Act so that it will be successful."

Congress has failed for over a year to appropriate money to keep the federal Act alive. While the law is technically on the books, it is moribund and of little positive value. Senators Magnuson and Jackson and Reps. Pelly and Adams have all introduced bills in Congress to drastically overhaul the Highway Beautification Act of 1965. So far the Administration has opposed any change.

There is general depression in the Bureau of Public Roads concerning highway beautification. They know that they are saddled with a bad law. They know that resistance to the law is widespread even among conservationists and other people interested in highway beautification. They know more than anyone else that the law is administratively a botch, and they know that Congress is not likely to vote funds to keep the Act

alive unless prodded to do so by the billboard interests.

It is revealing that the billboard companies publicly proclaim, by full page advertisements and by Letters to the Editor, their support for the federal law (Seattle PI, June 8, 1965 and December 1, 1967). In their support they stand virtually alone, for we do not know of any national organization, historically associated with beautification, the preservation of natural beauty and the promotion of safe and scenic highway travel, that supports the federal law. That the billboard companies are virtually alone in their support of the federal law is evidence of a law which does little to control billboards.

Congress must be made to realize that the federal Highway Beautification Act of 1965 is a fraud on the public expectations. The federal law must be repealed and the Congress must start all over again to prepare proper legislation. As it now stands highway beautification may be retarded for a decade or more. Orderly programs for this purpose cannot flower in the states in the face of the federal law. The Seattle Times said in an editorial on October 6, 1966:

"No law at all would be better than an act which is a mockery of all the noble words that have been uttered in Washington, D.C., about beautifying America's highways."

In the meantime the states had better hang onto the billboard control laws that they have, of which the Washington State "Highway Advertising Control Act of 1961" is the best in the land.

Teachers-in-Politics

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 5, 1968

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, as a former professor, I wish to congratulate the National Education Association for sponsoring a Teachers-in-Politics Weekend beginning April 5, and to endorse the NEA's efforts to increase teacher participation in politics.

In a democracy, every informed citizen should play an active role in the political process. The increasing influence of every level of government on our daily lives makes citizen participation ever more essential in order to exercise effective popular control over a government

sometimes insensitive to the people's needs. NEA encouragement of political activity by teachers—whose jobs involve them intimately in society's problems—is to be welcomed.

Moreover, because of the Federal Government's massive entry into aid to education in recent years, teachers have a duty to use their hard-won knowledge of education's strengths and weaknesses to work for continuing improvement in education policy.

Finally, greater teacher involvement in politics would certainly yield results beneficial to our youngsters. With so many students already deeply involved in politics, the wisdom and maturity of politically experienced teachers would, I believe, do much to steer student idealism into constructive, rather than destructive, channels.

I invite more teachers to run for public office, and I look forward to meeting more of my former colleagues in the halls of Congress in the not too distant future.

More Teachers Should Take Active Roles in Politics

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 5, 1968

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, this weekend has been designated by the National Education Association as Teachers-In-Politics Weekend.

Not only do I approve of teachers participating in politics, I strongly urge more teachers to take active roles and give constructive leadership in the political life of our Nation.

Teachers are equipped to give guidance to the community and they have a responsibility to generate and instill in our students an interest in our Government.

Great men in government, like President Lyndon Johnson and Senator EUGENE MCCARTHY, are former teachers—as was former President Woodrow Wilson.

In my district, State Senator Albert Rodda is a product of of the educational

community. He has proven himself many times to be a great asset to the California State Legislature.

In Sacramento's Third Congressional District, I am always ready to assist teachers at all levels of education to promote better government through educational-political involvement.

A Tragic Action

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 5, 1968

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., takes from our Nation much of its pride and much of its integrity. Our image is tarnished for all to see. That the tragic action stems from a tradition of violence and prejudice—and history of man's inhumanity to man—is beyond question.

This Nation can ill afford the loss of its leaders possessing true greatness. Let us hope for all that another with the vision—the calm courage of Dr. King—emerges to lead the cause to which he gave his all.

Much progress has been made toward understanding and equality—much more must be made—with an ever-increasing sense of urgency and an understanding that human hopes and aspirations, legitimate in their objectives, cannot be held on leash. Dr. King preached nonviolence. Let us hope his dreams can be achieved by his methods. Failure would be a national tragedy, fully integrated in its destructive force.

The "Pueblo"—How Long, Mr. President?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 5, 1968

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, this is the 74th day the U.S.S. *Pueblo* and her crew have been in North Korean hands.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, April 8, 1968

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil: for Thou art with me.—Psalm 23: 4.

Almighty God, Father of all men, stunned by the suddenness of tragedy and shocked by the fury of violence, we turn to Thee for help in this hour of our national need. May the spirit of wisdom guide us, the grace of understanding lead us, and the love of compassion direct us that we may find our way to the promised land of freedom for all, justice for all, peace for all, and finding the way give us courage to walk in it.

We pray that the comfort of Thy spirit may abide in the hearts of those who

walk through the valley of the shadow of death. May Thy presence make them strong, give them courage, and hold them steadfast to good will even in the midst of ill will.

"Cure Thy children's warring madness,
Bend our pride to Thy control;
Shame our wanton, selfish gladness,
Rich in things and poor in soul.
Grant us wisdom, grant us courage
That we fail not man nor Thee."

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 4, 1968, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 5799. An act to amend the District of Columbia Uniform Gifts to Minors Act to provide that gifts to minors made under such act may be deposited in savings and loan associations and related institutions, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 16324. An act to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following